

8692
THE

Sacrament of the Altar:

OR, THE

DOCTRINE

OF A

Representative SACRIFICE

IN THE

HOLY EUCHARIST

VINDICATED:

In Answer to a late Book intituled,

*A plain Account of the Nature and End of
the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*

Inscribed to every sincere Member of the Church
of ENGLAND.

*Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over
the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers (ἐπισκόπους
Bishops) to feed the church of God, which He (God the Son)
hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that af-
ter my departing, shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not
sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise,
speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.
Acts xx. 28, 29, 30.*

LONDON:

Printed for S. AUSTEN, at the Angel and Bible in St Paul's
Church-yard; and Sold by J. ROBERTS, at the Oxford-
Arms in Warwick-lane. 1735.

THE

Journal of the

of the

BOCTRIN

of the



HOLY

THE

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the

of the



THE
PREFACE.



HAVE two things to advertise the serious Reader of; the First is, That the Primitive Doctrine, which I have endeavoured to vindicate in the following Tract, is most directly opposite to the present Doctrine of that corrupt Church of Rome. The Church of Rome, in their Sacrifice of the Mass, pretend to offer up to God very Christ, whole Christ, God and Man hypostatically: Hence, according to them, the Sacrifice of the Mass is propitiatory in its own Nature, and to be worshipped, as being the very, natural, substantial Body and Blood of Christ: On the other hand, the primitive Doctrine maintains, that not the very natural, substantial Body and

Blood of Christ is offered to God in the Eucharist, but that Bread and Wine, as the appointed Representatives of Christ's Body and Blood, are to be offered according to Christ's own Institution, and that this representative Sacrifice is therefore propitiatory, not in its own Nature, not from any real, intrinsic Worth in itself; but by Institution, by virtue of the grand, personal Sacrifice of Christ, which by his Institution it is appointed to commemorate and represent; and that therefore the Materials of this representative Sacrifice are not to be worshipped, as not being substantially the Body and Blood of Christ, tho' they are indeed made so in Power and Effect, by the Presence and Blessing of the life-giving, eternal Spirit. It is therefore manifestly plain, that this primitive Doctrine directly overthrows the corrupt Doctrine of the Church of Rome: For if the Representatives of Christ's Body and Blood be offered in the Eucharist, then it is most certain, that very Christ himself cannot be there offered; because in the very Nature of Things, the Representative cannot be substantially the Person represented. And thus the Roman Idol of Transubstantiation falls to the Ground.

The next Thing I would advertise the serious Reader of is, That the primitive Doctrine, which I have endeavoured to
vindi-

vindicate, is most expressly recommended and enjoined by the Church of England: For (in the Homily of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament) she declares, " That before all things, this we must be sure of especially, that this Supper be in such wise done and ministred, as our Lord and Saviour did and commanded to be done, as his Holy Apostles used it, and the good Fathers in the primitive Church frequented it." Now it will (I trust) appear in the following Tract, both from Scripture and Antiquity, that the Lord's Supper is a Feast upon a Sacrifice, a Sacrifice or Oblation of Bread and Wine offered to God (according to Christ's own Institution) as the Representatives of Christ's Body and Blood, to bring the grand Sacrifice of Christ into Remembrance before God, that for the Sake of it, he may be propitious to us in the Pardon of our Sins, and in confirming to us the other Benefits of Christ's Death and Passion. Hence it will be easy for the Reader to perceive what our Church means, when she says presently after, We must take heed, lest of the Memory it be made a Sacrifice. The Words immediately following those above cited run thus, viz. For (as that worthy Man St Ambrose saith) " he is unworthy of the Lord, that otherwise doth celebrate that Mystery, than it was delivered by him. Neither

I

" can

“ can be be devout, that otherwise doth pre-
 “ sume, than it was given by the Author.
 “ We must then take heed, lest of the Me-
 “ mory, it be made a Sacrifice; lest of a
 “ Communion it be made a private Eating;
 “ lest of two Parts we have but one, &c.”
 Is it not hereby evidently plain, that our
 Church is here arguing against the Papists
 Doctrine of this Sacrament, against their
 Notions and Practice with regard to it?
 and not against the primitive Doctrine of
 it. The Meaning therefore of these Words,
 Lest of a Memory it be made a Sacrifice,
 is either this, viz. That we do not think, that
 the Memory of Christ's Death is sufficiently
 celebrated, when the oblatory Part is only
 perform'd, without administering the Ele-
 ments to the Congregation, as is daily done
 among the Papists; or else the Meaning is,
 that we do not of a memorial, representative
 Sacrifice, make it such a Sacrifice as the
 Papists pretend to offer, viz. the real Sacri-
 fice of the very natural, substantial Body
 and Blood of Christ: For that the Church
 does by no means declare against the primi-
 tive Doctrine of the Representative Sacri-
 fice, under the Symbols of Bread and Wine,
 is plain in that she declares, “ we must be-
 “ fore all things be sure of this, that this
 “ Supper be in such wise done and admini-
 “ stred, as our Lord and Saviour did and
 “ commanded to be done, as his holy Apo-
 “ stles

*“ fles used it, and as the good Fathers in
 “ the primitive Church frequented it.” And
 this will shew the Reader, that the following
 Words in the same Homily, are not to be ta-
 ken in a strict Sense, viz. “ This (i. e. to ac-
 knowledge no other Saviour, Redeemer, Me-
 diator, Advocate, Intercessor, but Christ
 only) “ is to stick fast to Christ’s Promise
 “ made in his Institution, to make Christ
 “ thine own, and to apply his Merits to
 “ thyself; herein thou needest none other
 “ Man’s Help, no other Sacrifice or Obla-
 “ tion, no sacrificing Priest, no Mass, no
 “ Means established by Man’s Invention.”
 It is plain, this is levelled against the Papist
 Doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass; and
 must be interpreted accordingly. If it be ta-
 ken in a strict Sense, it will contradict the
 whole Tenour and Design of the Homily, and
 make the Sacrament itself needless; for that
 cannot be administred in any Manner, with-
 out the Help of other Men; even accor-
 ding to our Author’s Notion, there must be
 some to communicate with us: Whoever there-
 fore will carefully read over the Homily,
 (which is in every respect quite opposite to our
 Author’s Notions) will find the plain natural
 Meaning of the Passage last cited, to be this;
 viz. that whereas the Papists lay great Stress
 upon the mere opus operatum; on the con-
 trary, we must not think that the Benefit of
 the Sacrament doth proceed from the Merit*

of the mere opus operatum, but that what is done by the Priest will stand us in no stead, without the concurrent Mediation and Merits of our Saviour's Death; and that no Sacrifice, abstracted from that of Christ on the Cross, can avail us to Salvation, The Reader will find the Doctrine and Practice of our Church farther vindicated, in the following Tract.

I have nothing more to add, but to desire of the Reader (as the Weight of the Subject requires) a fair and impartial Reading; which if he allows me, I trust he will find, that if the representative Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist have no stronger Adversary, than our Author, it will need no abler Defender than myself, who am minor minimo, and thine in the Lord.

5 0059



THE



THE
SACRAMENT
OF THE
ALTAR, &c.

THE Author of a late Book, entitled, *A plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, has not only bent all his Force to batter down the *Immovable Doctrine of a Representative Sacrifice* in the Holy Eucharist; but has sunk it down much lower than any I have ever yet heard of, except *Tindal* and his Disciples, with the Quakers, who make it no Duty at all. They, who have been no Friends to the *Primitive and Scriptural Doctrine of a Representative Sacrifice* in the Holy Eucharist, have yet asserted the Necessity of a *Priest*, to preside in the Celebration of it; they have maintain'd that the Elements of Bread and Wine being solemnly *set apart* by a Commission'd Officer, for the *Representations*

B

of

of Christ's Body broken, and his Blood shed, with Prayer for a *divine Blessing* to attend the Holy Symbols, to become to all *worthy* Receivers the *Seal* of Pardon and the *Conveyance* of divine *Grace*: But these things are all either *expressly* or by *direct* Consequence denyed by this Author. As he never once mentions the Necessity of a Commission'd Officer to preside in this Holy Feast, and as he expressly denies the Doctrine of *Blessing* the Bread and Wine, in the Sense of Prayer for a divine special Blessing upon them, and lays all the Stress upon bare *breaking* and *eating* Bread and drinking Wine in Remembrance of Christ, as an *absent* Person, he gives but too much Ground to suspect that he is no Enemy to the Position of the impious *Tindal*, who asserts, that *every one* (*viz.* Lay-man, or Woman) *may consecrate for themselves as effectually as any Priest*; tho' our Blessed Lord commissioned, not *Lay-men*, but his *Apostles*, to *do as he had done*, *i. e.* to take, *bless*, and break, and distribute to others. As to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper being the *Seal* of *Pardon*, and the *Conveyance* of divine *Grace*, this he expressly denies; nay, ridicules the Notion (as he speaks) of *fancying Communications and Impressions* from above in the performance of this Duty. His Book is likewise full of other Errors, and monstrous Positions, repugnant, in their plain Construction, to the receiv'd Doctrine of Christ's Catholic Church. I shall not therefore think my time mis-spent, nay I think it, upon many accounts, my Duty, to represent the *true* Doctrine of the Eucharist, by shewing the *false* Notions our Author has entertain'd, and endeavours

deavours to propagate concerning it.... But before I enter upon this, it will be very necessary to make a Remark or two upon his manner of setting out.

Page 5. He asserts, *That it is of small Importance to Christians to know what the many Writers upon this Subject, since the times of the Evangelists and Apostles, have affirmed.* And Page 7, he says, *Whatsoever was truly necessary at first, towards a right Understanding of this Ordinance, was without doubt contained in the first and earliest Accounts of it: Otherwise, says he, it must be said, that the very first Christians, who were called upon to perform this Duty, and who actually did perform it very frequently, were not fully instructed by the Apostles.* He allows therefore, that they who were instructed by the Apostles, were fully instructed in the Nature of this Institution; and yet, in contradiction to himself, he asserts, that it is of *small Importance* to Christians, to know what they have said in this Matter. I say, *in contradiction to himself*; for how can it possibly be of small Importance to know what those Writers have said about this Ordinance, who were fully instructed by the Apostles themselves in the Nature of it? On the contrary, in the Reason and Nature of things, are not the Accounts, which we have from those Writers, of this Institution, the *best*, or rather, the *only* means to let us into the full Sense and Meaning of those Accounts, which the Writers of the New Testament have left us? Certainly they are. It is therefore of *great Importance* to know what such Writers have said, concerning this Institution; because

they being instructed by the Apostles, are the fittest Persons to be consulted concerning the full Sense and true Meaning of what the Holy Pen-men have said concerning it. But our Author sets aside all other Writers, *antient*, as well as modern, whether they wrote *sooner* or *later* (page 8.) after the Apostles, and affirms it to be of *small Importance*, to know what they have said concerning this Matter ; *because*, says he, *a few Years make a great Alteration in Mens Notions and Language, about such Points of Religion.* (I wish this Observation may be verify'd in himself.) But let a few Years make never so great an Alteration in Mens Notions and Language, it cannot, with any manner of Reason, be affirmed, that the first and earliest Writers of Christianity, some of whom, as *Ignatius* and *Clement*, were instructed by the Apostles themselves, and others by such as had been so instructed, either did not know what Instructions they had received, or do not give such Accounts of this Ordinance, as were agreeable to those Instructions: This, I say, cannot with any manner of Reason be affirm'd, and our Author sets these antient Writers aside, not because he has any Reason to accuse them, either of corrupting the Notions they received from the Apostles, or of saying things concerning this Ordinance, contrary to those Notions; but only, because he is not ignorant, that those first and early Writers loudly testify against those low, dry, jejune, and debasing Notions, which he has entertain'd, and endeavour'd to propagate, concerning this most solemn Institution of our Religion.

But

But because our Author excepts against all the primitive Writers, whether they wrote *sooner* or *later*, as Persons, of whom he affirms it is of small Importance to know what they have said concerning this Subject; it may not be amiss to let the Reader see what little Reason he has, to except against their Testimony, in the Words of one, who has briefly, but clearly spoke home to this Point. “ Those
 “ Times of the Church, which were within
 “ four hundred Years after the Birth of
 “ Christ, were certainly the purest times of
 “ the Christian Church. The first hundred
 “ Years was under the Presidency of Christ
 “ himself, here on Earth, or of some of his
 “ Apostles; for St *John*, the beloved Disci-
 “ ple, did not die till about an hundred
 “ Years after the Nativity of our Saviour.
 “ The next fifty Years, at least, was under
 “ the Presidency of such Bishops, as had been
 “ instructed by the Apostles, or Apostolical
 “ Men; for the Apostles had many Assis-
 “ tants and Fellow-labourers, whose Names
 “ we meet with in the New Testament, as
 “ *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Sylvanus*, *Epaphroditus*, *Cle-*
 “ *mens*, and others, who were as careful to
 “ preserve the Purity of the Christian Faith
 “ and Worship, as the Apostles themselves.
 “ And we have reason to believe, that their
 “ immediate Successors, who were educated
 “ and ordained by them, would not immedi-
 “ ately corrupt the Faith and Worship of
 “ God, and deviate from the Apostolical
 “ Doctrine and Practice, especially when we
 “ consider that the Apostles, and Apostolical
 “ Men their Contemporaries, had the Gift of
 “ discern

“ discerning Spirits, and therefore would not
 “ set any Men over the Church, to govern it
 “ after their Death, whom they did not know
 “ to be sound in the Faith, and very unlike-
 “ ly to corrupt that Doctrine and Worship,
 “ which they had received from them. So
 “ that I think we may very well conclude,
 “ that the Church was not corrupt, whilst it
 “ was under the Presidency of the Apostles,
 “ or their immediate Successors; that is, for
 “ an hundred and fifty Years after the Birth
 “ of Christ. Neither have we any reason to
 “ think, that the Church was corrupted with-
 “ in the next hundred and fifty Years; for we
 “ find the *Authors of those times frequently ap-
 “ pealing to the Doctrines and Practices delivered*
 “ by the Apostles, and very zealous for the
 “ observing and retaining them pure and un-
 “ corrupt, and vigorously opposing all that
 “ would deviate from them. And in so short
 “ a Space of time, as an hundred and fifty, or
 “ two hundred Years, they could not but
 “ know what were the Apostolical Practices.
 “ They could not but know what kind of Go-
 “ vernment the Apostles had settled in the
 “ Church, what Orders of Ministers they had
 “ appointed, how and in what manner they
 “ administred Baptism, Confirmation, the Eu-
 “ charist, and such like, what kind of Service
 “ they used in their solemn Assemblies, what
 “ Feasts and Fasts they observed, or whether
 “ any at all. These, and other Matters of the
 “ same Nature, they could not but know as
 “ well as we can know, what were the
 “ Usages of our first Reformers, who lived
 “ about the same Distance of time from us,
 “ that

“ that the Apostles and their immediate Suc-
 “ cessors did, from those who lived at the
 “ latter end of the third, and the Beginning
 “ of the fourth Century. And for as much
 “ as we find that the Church continu’d the
 “ same Doctrine and Worship to the End of
 “ the fourth Century, and afterwards, which
 “ they observed in the Beginning of that
 “ Century, of which we have a clear Ac-
 “ count from the numerous Writers of that
 “ Age; we conclude with very good Reason,
 “ that for these first 400 Years after the
 “ Birth of Christ, the Church was as pure
 “ and uncorrupt, as we can expect to find her
 “ in her militant State, and consequently
 “ that the *Doctrine* and Discipline of the
 “ Church, in those first Ages, is the best
 “ Pattern we can have.”

Now the Fathers of these pure times, the
 four first Centuries, our Author knows, are
 point-blank against him, and for this Reason
 alone, he excepts against their Testimony :
 But whether this be a sufficient Reason, I shall
 leave my intelligent Reader to judge.

Well then, since he will not allow us any
 Help from the most antient Fathers, towards
 a right Understanding of the Nature of this
 Ordinance, or of those Passages in the New
 Testament, which speak of it; let us see what
 the Holy Pen-men have recorded concern-
 ing it. But who shall explain to us, the true
 Sense and Meaning of the Holy Pen-men, in
 those Passages? Shall we follow this Author’s
 Explication, or that of those antient, primi-
 tive Writers? They give us one Construction
 of those Passages, and he gives us another
 quite

quite different: Which must we chuse for our Guide? Him, who lives at the Distance of 1700 Years; or Them, who lived *in, or near* the Apostles times, and received this Ordinance, together with their Faith, from the Apostles themselves, or from those who were instructed by them? For my own Part, I shall be determined, not by the Explication and unnatural Glosses of our Author, but by the unanimous Sense, and concurrent Testimony of the primitive Writers; because, as he himself must allow, some of them were fully instructed by the Apostles, and therefore must in reason be deem'd *good* Interpreters of the sacred Pen-men: And I can see no Reason, why the same may not be affirmed, of those other antient Writers, who, tho' they received not their Instructions from the Apostles themselves, yet from such, as were instructed and set over the Churches by them.

Our Author indeed leaves his Readers *to their Right of judging for themselves*, Page 2. and gives us full Liberty to receive his Notions and Explications of Scripture, or to reject them as we find Cause. Let us therefore examine his Notions, and his Explications of Scripture, on which he founds his Notions, and see whether we have Cause to reject them, or not.

I will therefore, *First*, examine his Hypothesis.

2dly. I will examine his Explications of Scripture, on which his Hypothesis is grounded.

3dly. I will shew how much he has misrepresented the Doctrine of our Church, and how

how roughly he has handled our Communion Office.

And, *4thly*, I will point out some Passages, which, in their plain Construction, contradict the receiv'd Faith and Doctrine of Christ's Church.

In the first Place, I shall examine his Hypothesis. His Hypothesis is, *That the thing commanded to be done, " is to break Bread and " drink Wine, to keep up in our own Minds a " Remembrance of Christ, as of a Person corporally absent from us."* That the Reader may see, I do not misrepresent him, I shall quote his own Words. He says, *Page 24.* " The " End for which our Lord instituted this Duty, was the Remembrance of himself." *Page 29.* He says, " Whoever, therefore, in " a Serious and Religious Sense of his Relation to Christ, as his Disciple, performs " these Actions of eating Bread and Wine, " in Remembrance of Christ, as of a Person " corporally absent from his Disciples, most " certainly performs them agreeably to " the End of the Institution, declared by " Christ himself, to his immediate Disciples." You see, Reader, here is no mention of a Priest, *first* to *bless* the Bread and Wine into the *powerful* Representations of Christ's Body and Blood, before they are eaten and drunk: But the whole Stress is laid upon the *Actions* of eating Bread and drinking Wine, in Remembrance of Christ, *i. e.* as he explains himself, *Page 25, 28.* *In order to remember him.* You see, he has no Notion of an *Application* made to God, by *presenting* the Bread and

C

Wine

Wine to him, in Memory of Christ; no Notion of making a *Representation* to God of the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, in the *appointed* Memorials thereof: But sinks down the whole of the Ordinance into a *bare* Remembrance, as of an *absent* Friend; not proving it but taking it all along for granted, that our Saviour's Words, *do this*, τὸ το ποιείτε, signify, *Eat Bread and drink Wine*; and that, in *Remembrance of me*, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, signifies no more than a *bare* calling to mind, a *mere* bringing the thing into our own Memories: As if the whole of our Lord's Command and Commission, *Do this in Remembrance of me*, was no more than, *Eat Bread and drink Wine, to put yourselves in mind of me*. The Question therefore is, whether our Lord design'd this Institution, as a Rite *only to put ourselves in mind of him*, or as a Rite *to put God in mind of him*; whether it be to *represent*, and bring into *Remembrance* Christ's Death, *to ourselves alone*, or *to God principally and chiefly*? This Gentleman, as he supposes, that our Lord bid his Apostles do no more, than *break and eat Bread, and drink Wine*, (Page 20.) so he maintains, that it is only to put *ourselves* in mind of Christ's Death and Passion; and seems to endeavour to make his Readers believe, that our Church understands it so. On the other hand, the Catholic Doctrine maintains, that the Design of the Holy Eucharist, as instituted by our Saviour, is to put *God* in mind of Christ's Death and Passion, to represent to *him* the Death and Passion of his dear Son, by presenting to him the *appointed* Memorials of his Body and Blood, to the end, that for the Sake

of

of that Death and Passion, which is then represented to him, and of which he is, in the manner Christ has appointed, put in mind, he may be propitious to us miserable Sinners, and confirm to us all the Benefits of the New Covenant.

This appears, whether we consider the Words of Institution, the Reason and Nature of the thing itself, the Practice of Antiquity, or that of our own Church in particular, which this Author has very much, I know not whether willfully, misrepresented. 1. The Words of Institution, *Do this in Remembrance of me.* When our Lord said, *τὸτο ποιεῖτε, do this*, he either bid them *offer this*, or *do as he had done*; but he took Bread and Wine, and *blessed* them, by offering them to God as pledges of his natural Body and Blood, with Prayer for a divine special Blessing upon them, as I shall prove hereafter: *In Remembrance of me*, *ἕως τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, *for a Memorial of me*, to represent my Death and Passion to God, and to put him in mind thereof, thereby pleading my Death and Passion before him, for the Application of the Benefits procured by it. The original Word *ἀνάμνησις*, is the very Action of putting another in mind, which in the present Case, is *God*, not *ourselves*; for our Business here is with God, to make before him a Representation of the *grand* Sacrifice, that he may be propitious to us for the Sake of it. The Character this Author is said to bear, should make it unnecessary to tell him, that the original Word * *ἀνάμνησις*, or *Memorial*,

* Lev. xxiv. 7. See also Numb. x. 8, 9, 10.

rial, (which he all along uses in a very unscriptural Sense,) is the same Word, which is used in the *Mosaic* Law, for that Part of the Offering, wherewith the Atonement was made. When therefore our Lord, yielding up himself a Sacrifice for us, did say *Do this* (which is a sacrificial Term) *for a Memorial of me*, (which is another sacrificial Term) it is manifestly plain, that he did design this Institution for a perpetual Representation of this Sacrifice to God, unless we will depart from the plain, natural, accustomed Sense of the Expression in the Old Testament; for to God were all the Memorials under the Law offer'd, and by them the Oblation itself was render'd beneficial to the Offerers; and unless we will suppose, that our Lord, in ordaining an Institution, should use *two, known, sacrificial* Terms, and yet not intend a *Sacrifice*.

But to put this Matter beyond doubt, let us consider more particularly, what it was our Lord *did*, and what it was that he commanded his Apostles to *do*. Now I say, that our Lord then *gave* or *offered* to God Bread and Wine, as Pledges of his natural Body and Blood, and commanded his Apostles to give or offer to God Bread and Wine, as Figures of his Body and Blood, to bring the grand Sacrifice into Remembrance before God.

Our Lord says, *This is my Body given for you, This is my Blood shed*, ἐκχυνόμενον, poured out for you. He speaks in the present Tense, δίδόμενον ἐκχυνόμενον, what he gave to his Disciples, that he first gave for them: for of that which he gave to them, he said, *This is my Body given for you, This is my Blood poured out for you.*

His

His giving it *to* them, and his giving it *for* them, are two things perfectly distinct; and therefore when he says, *This is my Body given for you*, he plainly means *given*, or *offered* to God for you; and by consequence he did then *give* or *offer* to God the Bread and Wine, as Pledges of his Body and Blood.

Again, what is that, of which our Lord saith, *This is my Body given for you*? Every Protestant, except our Author, will answer, It was *consecrated* Bread, the Bread which he had *blessed*, and he himself will allow, it was Bread *broken*, [Page 19.] tho' not [Page 13.] *blessed*, in our Sense of *blessing* it. Well then, if our Lord called the Bread, which he had *blessed* or *consecrated*, *his Body given for them*; it is plain, that he *gave* or *offered* it, as his Body, to God; for what he called his Body, that he *gave to* God *for* them: This is my Body *given for you*. Our Saviour therefore does, as plainly as can be, declare, that he *gave* or *offered* himself, his natural Body and Blood to God, for them, under the Pledges of Bread and Wine.

Again, when our Lord says, *This is my Body given for you*, *this is my Blood poured out for you*; if you say he means, *This is the Figure of my Body*, or *this represents my Body, given for you*; *this is the Figure of my Blood*, or *this represents my Blood poured out for you*; why even thus it appears, that he *gave* or *offered* to God the Bread and Wine, as Pledges of his natural Body and Blood: for speaking in the present Tense, *is given*, *is now given*; *is poured out*, *now poured out*; it plainly appears that he did *then*, some how or other, *give* or *offer* his
Body

Body and Blood to God: And besides, if the Bread and Wine were Figures and Representations of Christ's Body *given*, and of his Blood *shed*, there must be something, wherein they do agree, that there may be a Foundation for calling them, *his Body and Blood given for them*: But now wherein do they agree? How are the Bread and Wine like to Christ's Body and Blood, except in that they are both Sacrifices or Oblations to God? Christ's Body was an Oblation *given*, or offered, to God; Christ's Blood was an Oblation *given*, or offered to God: and therefore Bread and Wine must be an Oblation offered to God, that this Figurative Speech may be true, *This is my Body given for you, this is my Blood shed for you*. Tho' indeed it is plain, that our Lord's Design was not to say, *This is the Figure of my Body, which (Figure) is now given for you*; because he did intend to give, or offer to God something more, than the bare Figure of it; which appears, in that he saith plainly and simply, *This is my Body now given for you*: Which whosoever shall duly consider, will find, that he did not mean barely, that he gave his natural Body to God, tho' he did so, or that he barely gave or offered to God the Figure of his Body for them; but that he gave or offered to God the Bread and Wine, as Pledges of his natural Body and Blood, or that he then gave or offered to God, his natural Body and Blood, under the Pledges of Bread and Wine. And this furnishes us with a plain, and the true Reason, *why* our Lord called the Bread and Wine his Body and Blood, viz. Be-
cause

cause he offered them, as Pledges of his natural Body and Blood, to his divine Father; because in *giving* or *offering* the *Bread* and *Wine* to God, he did in his own Intention offer and resign up his *Body* and *Blood*, as a Sacrifice for the Sins of Men.

Well then, if our Lord did give, or offer to God Bread and Wine, as Pledges of his natural Body and Blood, it is plain that he commanded his Apostles to do something more, than barely to *break* and *eat Bread* (as our Author's low Notion runs *Page 20.*) I suppose he will not deny, that Christ commanded (and I add, *commission'd*) his Apostles to do as he had done. But he offered Bread and Wine to God, as Pledges of his natural Body and Blood, (as we have now proved) with Prayers for a divine special Blessing (as I shall prove presently) of the Life-giving Spirit to attend them: this they were to do, this *Representative* Oblation, or Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood they were to make *in Remembrance of him*, or *for a Memorial of him*, *i. e.* (as I have already shew'd) to bring the *Grand* Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood into Remembrance before God, that he may see it, and behold it in the *appointed* Memorials thereof, and for the sake of it be propitious to us, in the Pardon of our Sins, and in confirming to us all other Benefits of the New Covenant, procured by the *Grand* Sacrifice, then commemorated and represented to be before him.

2dly. This will farther appear from the Reason and Nature of the thing itself. All Sorts of People who call themselves Christians, except

cept the Quakers; do hold the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a *Religious Duty*; and if it be a religious Duty, it must be performed *to and before God*, as all other religious Duties are; and consequently the Commemoration and Representation of our Lord's Death and Passion, made in this Ordinance, must be made *to and before God*, otherwise it has not the Nature of a religious Duty. If therefore we will allow, that this Ordinance is a religious Duty, it is apparently manifest, that when our Lord commanded and commissioned his Apostles, and in them their Successors and Substitutes, *to make a Memorial of him*, he commanded and commissioned them to make the Memorial *to God*: And when St. Paul says *we do shew forth the Lord's Death**, if his Ordinance be a religious Duty, he must be understood to mean, that we shew forth the Lord's Death *to God*, by representing to him the Death and Passion of his dear Son, in the appointed Memorials thereof. They therefore, who say this Representation is not made to God, but to Man, do indeed make this Ordinance to be no religious Duty; nay, they do in some Sense set up themselves as *Idols*, as if the Memorial of Christ's Priesthood and Death was made *to and before them*.

3dly. The Practice of Antiquity makes it plain, that the primitive Church, in the first and purest Ages, did understand this Holy Rite, as design'd *to render God propitious to us*, by representing to him the Merits of our Saviour's

* See Deut. xxvi, 3. Where the same Word is us'd.

Sufferings. The Fathers frequently speak of *making a Memorial before God of the grand Sacrifice*: But not to mention at present, what they have said concerning this Matter, the Point in hand will clearly appear from the express Words of all the antient Liturgies. In that of *St Clement*, speaking to God, *We commemorate his (viz. Christ's) Death and Passion, &c.—do offer to thee our King and our God, this Bread and this Cup according to his Institution, beseeching thee to look graciously on these our Gifts, laid in thy Presence.* In that of *Jerusalem*, called *St. James's*, *We offer to thee this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice.* In several others, *We offer this mystical and unbloody Sacrifice.* In all of them we find *προσφέρμεν*, *We offer.* Now does it not appear plain from hence, that they thought the Memorial, which Christ commanded, was to be made to God? Is it not manifest, that they made the Representation of Christ's Death and Passion to God, by offering to him the appointed Representation of his Son's Body and Blood, in order to render him propitious to Man, and to plead the Merits of Christ to the Forgiveness of our Sins.

4^{thly}. Is not this likewise the Sense and Practice of our own Church, how much soever this Author may have endeavoured to disguise, or misrepresent it? According to the Sense and Practice of our Church, *A Representation of Christ's Death and Passion is made to God*, and therefore this Ordinance (according to the Sense and Practice of our Church) is not a bare Calling to mind, a bare Refreshment of

our own Memories; but it is a solemn Application to God for Pardon and Grace, and all other Benefits of Christ's Passion, by representing to him the Death and Passion of his dear Son. In the most solemn Prayer of Consecration, the Priest applies to God for the Benefits of Christ's Death and Passion, by reminding him, and representing to him, what Christ did, and commanded to be done. He says to God, *Grant, that we receiving these thy Creatures.* He calls them *God's Creatures* in a more especial Manner, as being presented, dedicated, or *offered* to him in Memory of Christ. Then he makes before God, a Representation of the Sacrifice of Christ: He *takes* the Elements, and holds them *to and before* God, *breaking* the Bread, to make a Memorial to God of Christ's Body, torn with Nails upon the Cross, and *pours* out the Wine, and takes it up, as a Memorial of Christ's Blood shed for us; laying his Hands upon both, to signify, that on him were laid the Sins of the World, as having undertaken them in the Covenant of Grace. Now can it bear any Question, whether the Sacrifice of Christ's Death is here represented *to God*, or whether only to the People? The Prayer of Consecration is addressed to God from the Beginning to the End, and the Words of Institution are by our Church made Part of that Prayer, and therefore are evidently directed to God, as well as the rest of that Prayer. The Priest speaks *to God*, when he says, *Who in the same Night, &c.* It is evident therefore, that all he says and does, is directed to God; the Representation which he makes of the Sacrifice of Christ, is
made

made to God. And to what End doth the Priest represent to God the Sacrifice of Christ, but in order to procure from God, the Effects and Purchase of that Sacrifice? as appears from the Prayer immediately before that of Consecration, *that our sinful Bodies may be made clean, &c.* and from the Prayer afterwards, *most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the Merits and Death of thy Son, (which he had just before represented to God) we and all thy whole Church may obtain Remission of Sins, and all other Benefits of his Passion.*

This Author's Notion therefore has no Foundation, either in the Words of Institution, or in the Reason and Nature of the thing, or in the Practice of Antiquity, or of our own Church, all which do on the contrary conspire in this, *viz. That the Lord's Supper is a Memorial and Representation made to God, of the Sacrifice which Christ once offered; wherein we set before God the Bread and Wine, as Figures or Images of the precious Blood of Christ, shed for us, and of his precious Body; to put God, by these memorial Oblations, in mind of him, and to beseech God thereby to be merciful to his Church and People, and to be mindful of the Covenant of Grace established on the Priesthood, and Sacrifice of Jesus Christ.*

Possibly our Author may make light of all this, and think it sufficient to say, that God can never forget the Sacrifice of Christ, and therefore has no need to be put in mind of it. But this carries no Weight with it; for God knows our Wants before we pray unto him, and has no need that we should tell him of

them, yet he commands and expects our Prayers. The Memorial of our Lord's Death and Passion is made to God, not barely to refresh the divine Memory, as if he could forget; but it is the Christian Rite of Worship and Supplication, the *instituted* Claim, and pleading of the Covenant of Grace. And it becomes all Persons to remember, that God will be worshipped after his own *appointed* Manner, not according to our Fancies; and that if we would effectually plead the Covenant of Grace, we must do it in the Manner, and by the Means, which the Author of that Covenant has instituted.

But this Notion of the Lord's Supper, as a Representation made to God, of the grand Sacrifice of Christ, in the appointed Memorials of his Body and Blood, he is pleas'd to call a *Stage-play*, [Page 55.] Certainly this kind of Language is altogether unbecoming the Character, he is said to bear; and how little Reason he has to use it, will yet farther appear, upon examining the Explication he is pleas'd to give us of those Texts of the New Testament, from whence *alone*, he pretends to draw his whole Doctrine of this Institution. And this is the Second thing I propos'd to do, *viz.* to examine his Explications of Scripture, on which his Hypothesis is grounded.

The Passages which he first comments upon are, *Math. xxvi. 26. &c. Mark xiv. 22. &c. Luke xxii. 19. &c. 1 Cor. xi. 23. &c.* He begins with complaining of our Translation, for rendering the Words of St *Mathew, He took Bread and blessed it, and says, the Word, it,*
is

is added, without any thing in the Original to answer it, or require it, and that it should be truly expressed thus, *Jesus having taken Bread, and having blessed God, he brake it, &c.* The Sum of what he offers [in Page 12, 13.] in Vindication of this Rendition, is this, *viz.* “ *St Luke* “ and *St Paul*, after speaking of our Saviour’s having taken Bread into his Hands, “ instead of *εὐλογήσας*, add, *εὐχαριστήσας*, “ (which our Translation indeed, [tho’ improperly] renders, *having given Thanks.*) “ This later Word, he asserts, can signify “ nothing, but *having given Thanks* to God; “ from hence he concludes, that the former must “ signify nothing else, and by Consequence “ the rendering of *St Matthew* and *St Mark* “ must be, *having blessed God*, in the Sense of “ giving Thanks and Praise to him.” He farther argues, “ that *St Matthew* and *St Mark* themselves direct us thus to interpret “ their own Word relating to the Bread, by “ their using the Word *εὐχαριστήσας*, when they “ speak of the Cup, the very same Word “ which *St Luke* and *St Paul* use of the “ Bread:” from whence he concludes, “ that “ nothing but *giving Thanks and Praise to God*, “ was implied in the Word *Blessing*,” used of the Bread, by *St Matthew* and *St Mark*. “ Because, says he, no one will say, that “ blessing the Bread, in any Sense, different “ from *giving Thanks to God over it*, was any “ more needful or agreeable to our Saviour’s “ Design, than doing the same to the Cup.” In all which he begs the Question, by taking it for granted, without Proof, that *εὐχαριστήσας* can signify nothing, but *having given*

given Thanks to God, the contrary to which is evident, viz. that *ευχαριστέω* signifies the same as *εὐλογέω*, which signifies *to procure by Prayer a divine special Blessing upon any Creature*. The Miracle of the five Loaves and the two small Fishes, is recorded by all the four Evangelists. St *Matthew* xiv. 19, and St *Mark* vi. 41. use the Word *εὐλόγησε*, *he blessed*, viz. the Loaves and the Fishes: St *Luke* ix. 16. uses the same Word, and what is particularly to be observed, he expressly says, *He blessed them*, *εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς*, *he blessed them*, viz. the five Loaves and the two small Fishes. What, did he give Thanks to the Loaves and the Fishes? No! sure. But he blessed *them*, that is, he did by Prayer obtain the divine Power to descend upon them. It is evident therefore, that *εὐλογέω* signifies, *to procure by Prayer, a divine special Blessing upon a thing*. And that *ευχαριστέω* signifies the same, is plain from St *John's* Words, Chap. vi. 11. *ευχαρισήσας διέδωκε*. Now it is plain, that St *John* by *ευχαρισήσας*, means the very same, as St *Matthew* and St *Mark* by *εὐλόγησε*, and St *Luke* by *εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς*, *He blessed them*, viz. the Loaves and the Fishes. It is false therefore, that *ευχαρισήσας* can signify nothing but *having given Thanks to God*; since St *John* undeniably uses it of the Loaves for *blessing them*, i. e. for procuring by Prayer, a divine special Blessing upon them. Since therefore St *Matthew* and St *Mark*, in the History of Institution, speaking of what our Lord did, when he had taken the Bread, use a Word, which both themselves and St *Luke* do elsewhere undeniably use for *procuring by Prayer a divine special Blessing*

Blessing, and speaking of what our Lord did, when he had taken the Cup, use a Word, which St *John* evidently uses in the very same Sense; it is plain that St *Luke's* and St *Paul's* *εὐχαιρήσας*, is the very same as St *Matthew's* and St *Mark's* *εὐλογήσας*. They both signify one and the same Thing, namely, *having blessed*, in the Sense of *procuring by Prayer, a divine Blessing*; which Blessing must terminate on what our Saviour took, *viz.* the Bread and the Cup; and therefore our Translation is right, *he took Bread and blessed it, i. e.* he procured by Prayer a divine Blessing upon it. And the same may be rendered concerning the Cup, *viz. he blessed it*; and thus in due Propriety it ought to be render'd; for that *εὐχαιρήσας*, when us'd of the Cup, signifies the same, as when it is used of the Bread, is evident from what has been said, and that in both Cases, it is used for blessing the Bread and Wine, in the Sense of procuring by Prayer a divine Blessing upon them, is farther confirm'd from St *Paul's* Saying, 1 Cor. x. 16. *the Cup of Blessing which [Cup] we bless*: For every one must allow, that blessing the Cup (in the Sense we have proved he did bless it) was not more necessary to our Saviour's Design, than blessing the Bread in the same Sense.

He goes on, Page 19, to give us a Paraphrase of the History of Institution, wherein he very notably explains away the Life and Sense of our Saviour's Words. The Sense, says he, (of *take, eat, this is my Body, given for you; do this in Remembrance of me; this is my Blood, shed for you*) may be thus expressed; "Take and eat this Bread now broken;
I " which

“ which I call my Body at this time consider-
 “ ed by me, as actually given, broken, and
 “ deprived of Life for your good ; tho’ not
 “ yet done, as you certainly know, who now
 “ see me. But I now give you this Bread,
 “ and call it my Body, in order to shew you
 “ that you are to take and eat Bread in this
 “ manner, after my Death ; and to introduce
 “ my Command to you, *to do this, to break*
 “ and *eat* Bread in Remembrance of me,
 “ and of my Body broken, after it shall be
 “ broken, and after I shall be removed from
 “ you. In like manner, drink ye all of this
 “ Cup, *i. e.* the Wine in it, which I now call
 “ my Blood, tho’ I have not yet shed it, in
 “ order to shew you, that you are to drink of
 “ Wine, in this Manner, in Remembrance of
 “ my Blood, &c.”

There is not a Sentence in this cold lifeless
 Comment, but what is justly to be rejected.
 In the first Place, he makes our Saviour give
 to his Apostles nothing but *mere Bread broken* :
 But we have proved, that our Lord *blessed*
 the Bread, and said of it, *This is my Body gi-*
ven for you, before he gave it to them ; and
 therefore what he gave to them, was not *mere*
Bread broken ; but Bread first *blessed*, and then
 broken, *i. e.* what he gave to them was Bread
 and Wine, which he had first given or offered
 to God for them, as Pledges of his natural
 Body and Blood, with Prayer for a divine
 Blessing upon them, *viz.* the Bread and Wine
 offer’d to God, as Pledges of his Body and
 Blood. . . In the next Place, he makes our Sa-
 viour call the *Bread, his Body*, merely because
 they were after his Death to *eat Bread*, in Re-
 membrance

membrance of him; and the *Wine*, his *Blood*, merely because after his Death, they were to *drink* Wine in Remembrance of his Blood. But if this be all the Reason why our Lord, in the Institution of the Eucharist, called the *Bread* and the *Wine*, his *Body* and *Blood*, merely because his Followers were, after his Death, to eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of him; our Lord might, for any Reason this Author can give to the contrary, as well have called the Leaves, on which the History of his Passion is wrote, his *Body* and *Blood*; for I suppose, he will not deny, that a good Christian is obliged to read the History of Christ's Passion in Remembrance of him, as well as to eat Bread and drink Wine in Remembrance of him. But we have already proved, that the Reason, why our Lord called the *Bread*, his *Body*, and the *Wine*, his *Blood*, was, because he offered them to God, as Pledges of his *Body* and *Blood*, with Prayer for a divine special Blessing upon them. . . . In the next Place, he makes the Command (and I add Commission) given by our Lord to his Apostles, in these Words, *Do this in Remembrance of me*, to mean no more than, *Break and eat Bread in Remembrance of me*. But surely no Man that reads the History with any Degree of Attention, but must see, that our Lord commanded his Apostles *to do*, what he had *done*, in Remembrance of him, or for a *Memorial of him*: But we have proved, that he offered Bread and Wine to God, as Pledges of his *Body* and *Blood*, with Prayers for a divine special Blessing upon them, *i. e.* he first blessed the Bread and Wine, and then gave it

to them to be eaten and drunk, as his Body and Blood; therefore *they* also were to take Bread and Wine, and *bleſs them*, i. e. offer them to God, as Figures of Chriſt's Body and Blood, with Prayers for a divine Bleſſing of the holy Spirit upon them, and then to give the holy Symbols, thus *bleſſed*, to others, to be eaten and drunk.

And here I cannot paſs by his *excellent* Comment on 1 Cor. xi. 23. *Do this, as often as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me*, i. e. according to him, Page 21, *As often as ye ſhall meet to drink Wine profeſſedly for this Purpoſe, take care that ye always do it, not as drinking at a common Meal, but in a religious Remembrance of me*; that is in plain Terms, as often as ye ſhall meet together to drink Wine in Remembrance of me, take care that ye drink it in Remembrance of me. But ſurely he cannot be ignorant that τῷ το ποιεῖτε, ſignifies neither, *drink this*, nor *meet together to drink this*; ποιεῖν never ſignifies to *drink*, but either to *make*, or to *offer*. Now I ſuppoſe, no one will imagine, that our Saviour could ſay, *Make this*, (the Wine) *as often as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me*: And therefore I ſay the plain *Engliſh* of τῷ το ποιεῖτε, both in Luke xxii. 19. and here in 1 Cor. xi. 23. is, *Offer this*, (viz. the Cup) *as often as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me*. And that ποιεῖν ſignifies to *offer*, and is ſo uſed both by the Septuagint, and in the New Teſtament, as well as by the Claffics, he knows, has been proved beyond Contradiſtion; *Hickes's Chriſtian Prieſthood*, Vol. I. Page 58. &c. where the ſame is proved from *Clement*, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Chryſoſtom*, &c. *Blackwall's Sacred Claffics*,

Classics, Vol. I. Page 33. But whether he will allow τῷ ποιεῖν, to be literally, *offer this*, or not; yet if he will allow, (and surely he cannot deny it) that our Lord commanded his Apostles to do, as he had done, in Remembrance of him, or for a *Memorial of him*, it comes to the same; for (as we have already proved) our Lord offered Bread and Wine to God, as Pledges of his Body and Blood, with Prayer, &c. therefore I say, when our Lord says of the Bread, (according to our *English Translation*) *Do this in Remembrance of me*, it is as much as to say, *Do this to the Bread, that I have done to it, i. e. offer it to God, with Prayer for a divine Blessing upon it, for the Memorial of me*: And when he says of the Cup (according to our *English Translation*) *Do this as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me*; it is as much as to say, *Do this to the Cup, that I have done to it, i. e. offer it to God, with Prayer for a divine Blessing upon it, as often as ye drink it, for a Memorial of me*.

By what has hitherto been said, I hope it appears sufficiently plain, from the History of Institution, that our Lord in instituting the Eucharist, did intend a *Representative Sacrifice* of his Body and Blood, under the Symbols of Bread and Wine, to be offer'd to God, for a perpetual Memorial of him, *i. e.* to bring the Grand Sacrifice, from time to time into Remembrance before God, that he may see it and behold it, in the *appointed* Memorials thereof, and remember it for our Good: And that all Antiquity understood it so, is too notorious to be denied.

I proceed to consider the next Passage, that our Author *comments* upon, *viz.* 1 Cor. x. 16, —22. The Assertors of the Representative Sacrifice in the Eucharist, alledge this Passage, as that, wherein the Apostle speaks of the Communion, as a *Sacrifice*, or a Feast of Bread and Wine, offered to God, as the Representatives of his Son's Body and Blood. The Sum of what they alledge in Proof of this is to this Purpose, *viz.* The Apostle *ver.* 14. bids the Christians flee from Idolatry, by which (see *ver.* 7,) he means, *Eating things offered to Idols.* The Argument, which he urges against Christians eating Meats offered to Idols, is this, *viz.* that the eating of any thing offered to any reputed God, is in it's own Nature, and in common Construction, an Act of Communion, a holding *Fellowship* with that God; therefore Christians could not, consistently with their Religion, eat of what was offered to Idols (which was to have *Fellowship* with Devils *ver.* 20.) *they could not drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils, they could not be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils, i. e.* they could not hold Communion, or *Fellowship* with both. The Apostle takes it for granted, that by eating of what was sacrificed, or offered to Idols, Men did communicate or hold *Fellowship* with Devils; (see *ver.* 20,) therefore when he saith, *ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils,* as by *drinking the Cup of Devils,* he plainly means *holding Fellowship,* or Communion, with Devils, by means of drinking what had been offered in Honour to them, so by Consequence, by *drinking the Cup of the Lord,* he

he must mean, holding *Fellowship* or Communion with the *true* God, by drinking what had been offered in Honour to him; otherwise the Argument fails, and the Parallel is lost. The Point, which the Apostle insists upon, is, that they could not, consistently with their Religion, hold *Fellowship*, or Communion with false Gods, and with the *true* God: But the Way of holding *Fellowship*, or Communion with false Gods, or *Devils*, (compare *ver.* 20, 21.) is by eating and drinking things offered to them; therefore the Way of holding *Fellowship*, or Communion with the *true* God, is by eating and drinking things offered to him. And that the *Oblation* of Bread and Wine is implied in the Parallel, which the Apostle draws between the Lord's Supper, and the Sacrifices of the Gentiles, is fully made appear in *Hickes's Christian Priesthood*, from Page 80, to 92, and *Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice*, Vol. I. Page 96, and Vol. II. Page 11, to which excellent Books I refer the Curious Reader.

Well, but what says our Author to this? Why he gives us a long tedious Comment of his *own*, for 6 Pages, wherein *longa verborum ambage*, he has explained away the Life and Soul of the Apostles Discourse, and when he has turn'd it topsy-turvy, backwards and forwards, and all Ways, for several Leaves, he can at last make no more of the Apostle's Argument than this, *viz.* Page 47. "You
 " *Christians eat Bread and drink Wine, in a religious Remembrance of Christ your Master, and*
 " *therefore ought not to do the like Acts in a superstitious Honour to the Idols of the Heathen;*
 " *whose*

“ *whose Worship he came to destroy. This, says*
 “ *he, is the Argument, and the Guilt of such a*
 “ *Behaviour is the whole Ground of it.*” But
 by the way we must take this along with us;
 that what was eaten in Honour to the Idols,
 was first offered in Honour to them; and
 therefore I say, to make the Parallel and the
 Argument good, what was eaten by the Chris-
 tians in the Eucharist in Honour to the true
 God, was first offer’d in Honour to him. And
 whoever will be at the Trouble to read our
 Author’s long Paraphrase, will find it mighti-
 ly defective, without this Supposition, *viz.*
 that what Christians eat and drank in Remem-
 brance of Christ, was first offered to the true
 God, as what the Heathens eat in Honour to
 their false Gods, had been first offered to
 them.

All that our Author can make of *the Cup of*
Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion
of the Blood of Christ? the Bread which we break,
is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?
 I say, all that he can make of this; is this, *viz.*
 “ When we Christians in our religious Assem-
 “ blies, partake in common of the *Cup of*
 “ *Blessing*, or the *Thanksgiving Cup*, the *Cup*,
 “ over which we speak good Words of Praise
 “ and Thanksgiving to God; do we partake
 “ of this, as drinking *Wine* provided for an
 “ ordinary Entertainment? No certainly;
 “ but as *Wine* appointed to be a Memorial
 “ of the *Blood* of Christ, shed for us. Is it
 “ not therefore in it’s plain Design, the *Joint-*
 “ *partaking* (or *Communion*) of that which
 “ brings to Remembrance, and in his Insti-
 “ tution is called his *Blood*? When in the
 “ same

“ same Solemnity we *break* and *eat* Bread, is
 “ not this the *Joint-partaking* (or Communion)
 “ of that which is appointed for the Remem-
 “ brance of his Body, and is therefore by him
 “ called his Body? ”

Where in the first Place he makes, *the Cup of Blessing*, ὃ εὐλογῶμεν, *which* (Cup) *we bless*, to be no more, than the Cup *over which we speak good Words of Praise and Thanksgiving to God*. But I desire it may be remembered, what I have already proved, that εὐλογέω signifies to *procure by Prayer a divine special Blessing*: This Blessing terminates on the Cup, *i. e.* the Wine in it; for the Verb is used *transitively*, ὃ εὐλογῶμεν, *which Cup we bless*. But if he will have εὐλογέω here to signify, *to give Thanks*, it cannot be to God, but to the Cup; for ὃ (*which*) is the Accusative Case govern'd of εὐλογῶμεν, (*we bless*) and therefore according to him it should be rendered thus, *viz. the Cup of Thanksgiving, to which Cup we give Praise and Thanks*. What, give Thanks to the Cup? No, sure! But give Thanks to God, and *bless* the Cup, by offering it to God with Prayer for a divine special Blessing. He is pleas'd to render it, *over which we speak good Words of Praise and Thanksgiving to God*: But ὃ εὐλογῶμεν can never be so render'd, as every one, that is not altogether ignorant of the Greek Tongue, can testify; for the Verb εὐλογῶμεν refers not to God, but to the Cup, *which* (Cup) *we bless*: And this must be either, *which Cup we bless by Prayer for a divine special Blessing upon it*; or, *which Cup we bless in the Sense of giving Thanks and Praise to it*. This latter Construction is strangely incongruous

gruous, therefore the former is good. He says indeed in his Note, that *Chrysoſtom* and *Theophylaſt* interpret the Words in the Manner that himſelf does. As to *St Chryſoſtom's* Words, they are not to be taken in the Senſe our Author puts upon them; for whoever will read *St Chryſoſtom's* Liturgy, and the Quotations from him in the Appendix of *Johnſon's Unbloody Sacrifice*, will ſoon find that *St Chryſoſtom* had a quite different Notion of *bleſſing the Cup*, from what our Author has of it: *St Chryſoſtom* believed the Bread and Wine in the Eucharift to be *ſo bleſſed*, as to become the *Body* and *Blood* of Chriſt, tho' not ſubſtantially, yet in Power and Effect, by being offered to God with Prayer for the Power of the Life-giving Spirit to reſt and attend upon them. And I make no Doubt but that *Theophylaſt* believed the ſame. And unleſs our Author can prove, that the Cup, over which they gave Thanks, was *not bleſſed*, in the Senſe I have given, he proves nothing.

In the next Place, he makes, *Is it not the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt?* and *Is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt?* to mean no more, “ than a *Joint-partaking*, in common “ with others, of that which is to be *eaten* and “ *drunk* in Remembrance of Chriſt's Body “ and Blood.” I pray you, Reader, to obſerve, that the Word *κοινωνία*, which he renders a *Joint-partaking of any thing in common with others*, refers not to *us*, who eat and drink, but to *that* which is eaten and drunk by us in the Holy Eucharift. The Apoſtle ſaith, it is the *Bread*, which is the *Communion* of the Body of Chriſt, and the *Wine*, which is the
Communion

Communion of the Blood of Christ: The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? the Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? So that without all Doubt, it is the Bread and the Cup, which are here expressly determined to be the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ: and this entirely destroys his Notion of a *Joint-partaking*. That we do in the Eucharist jointly partake, in common with others, of that Bread, which (*Bread*) is the *Communion* of Christ's Body, and of that Wine, which (*Wine*) is the Communion of Christ's Blood, I do allow: But to explain this Text, is not to tell us what we *do* in the Holy Communion, but to shew us in *what Sense* the *Bread* is the *Communion* of Christ's Body, and the *Wine* of his Blood. And I must beg leave to observe to him, that the Primitive Church believed the *Bread* to be the *Communion* of Christ's Body, and the *Wine* the *Communion* of his Blood, by means of the enlivening Energy of the Life-giving Spirit attending it, and going with it, making it to be the Body and Blood of Christ in Power and Effect, to all Intents and Purposes, that the natural Body and Blood it self could serve, were they actually present. And if they believ'd aright in this Point, (as I make no doubt but they did) then the eating that Bread, which is the Communion of Christ's Body, and the drinking of that Wine, which is the Communion of Christ's Blood, must needs be most beneficial to all worthy Receivers, even the Means of our holding Fellowship with God, and of having the Grace of the divine Spirit convey'd to us: tho' this Au-

F

thor

thor, *pondere temporalium pressus*, can raise his Conceptions no higher, than to mere Bread and Wine, empty Types, void of Life and Spirit.

He insists much upon it, and labours hard to prove it, (*Pages 40, 41, 42, 43, &c.*) that the Apostle in this Discourse speaks nothing of the Benefits of Christ's Death, or of the Lord's Supper. I answer, the Apostle is most manifestly to be understood, of holding Fellowship with the *true* God by means of the Eucharist, as the Gentiles suppos'd themselves to hold Fellowship with their Idols, (which were indeed false Gods, even Devils) by means of the Sacrifices offer'd to them; otherwise his Parallel does not run even: And I suppose, he will allow, that there is, at least, some Benefit in holding Fellowship with the true God. He says, *Page 42*, it quite alters the Intent of the Apostle to represent him, arguing thus: "The *Jews* partaking of the Sacrifices, partake of all the Benefits accruing to the Offerers themselves: therefore it will be the same with you in the Heathen Feasts." — Well, be it so: But I hope it will not alter the Intent of the Apostle, to represent him arguing thus, "The *Jews* partaking of the Sacrifices, do thereby hold Fellowship with the *true* God;" therefore if you partake of the Sacrifices offered to false Gods *i. e.* to Devils, you will hold Fellowship with them. And from hence a very good Argument may be form'd against their eating Meats offer'd to Idols, *i. e.* to Devils, *viz.* that they could not consistently with their Religion, hold Fellowship

ship
beca
But
not
Dev
ble, a
Ye ca
Tabl
Hea
pos'
vils,
Dev
the
ship
postl
Fello
incom
woul
trary
fit co
cru
even
Righ
selve
cruin
fered
postl
cruin
fered
ver.
Fello
it was
shew
ther
the
the g

ship with the *true* God, and with false Gods, because it implies two contrary Covenants. . . . But says he, *Page 43*, the Meaning of *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils*; *ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils*, cannot possibly be, *Ye cannot be Partakers of the Benefits of the Lord's Table, and of the Benefits of the Tables of the Heathen Deities*. No, who ever said, or suppos'd it was? But *to partake of the Table of Devils*, (compare ver. 20.) is to *hold Fellowship with Devils*; and therefore *to partake of the Table of the Lord*, or the *true* God, is to hold Fellowship with him: And therefore, I say, the Apostle's Argument is, that *they could not hold Fellowship with them* (both): That would be inconsistent with their Religion; because it would be binding themselves under two contrary Covenants. But, says he, "*No Benefit could be suppos'd by him* (the Apostle) *to accrue from these* (the Sacrifices offered to Idols) *even to the Heathen Worshippers themselves*." Right, but the Heathen Worshippers themselves might, and did suppose some Benefit accruing to themselves, from the Sacrifices offered to their supposed Gods: And the Apostle is so far from supposing any Benefit accruing to those, that eat of the Sacrifices offered to these Idols, that he expressly says, *ver. 20*, that by so doing they would hold Fellowship with Devils. And I ask whether it was not much to the Apostle's Purpose, to shew them, not only the Inconsistency, or rather Impossibility of holding Communion with the *true* God, and with false Gods, but also the great Sin and Danger of so doing, in that

they would hold Fellowship with Devils, and so receive much Harm and Damage to their Souls? ... He tells us, *Page 45*, “ that the “ Apostle’s whole Argument supposes an I- “ dol to be *a Nothing*; and that the Ground “ of the Apostle’s forbidding the Christians “ to eat Meats offered to Idols, was, that it “ would be turn’d to an ill Use by their Hea- “ then Neighbours...” In answer to this I need only to observe (1) that the Apostle not only supposes, but expressly affirms, *ver. 20*, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils; and therefore he does not suppose an Idol to be *a mere Nothing*: (2) The Apostle expressly says, that if they did drink of the Cup of Devils, or were Par- rakers of the Table of Devils, *i. e.* if they did eat of such Meats as had been offered in Ho- nour to the Idols of the Gentiles, they would have *Fellowship with Devils*; and therefore he does not dissuade the Christians from eating things offered to Idols, merely because it would be turn’d to an ill Use by their Heathen Neighbours, but because by eating and drink- ing such Meats, they would hold Fellowship with Devils; they would put themselves into Covenant with Devils, and be out of Covenant with the *true God*; for that they could not communicate, or hold Fellowship with *both*.

And now he comes to fight Tooth and Nail with the Asserters of a Representative Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, and thinks he has us hard and fast, *Page 47*; because “ In “ this Parallel, tho’ the Apostle found Occa- “ sion to speak expressly of *Offerings* and Sa- “ crifices

“ crifices made to Idols; and of the Altar in
 “ the *Jewish* Temple; yet when he comes to
 “ speak of the Lord’s Supper, he does not once
 “ represent the *Bread* and *Wine*, as things of-
 “ fered, or sacrificed upon an Altar, (which,
 “ says he, he could not have avoided, had he
 “ had that Notion of them) but in the plainest
 “ Words, speaks of the Cup of the Lord, and
 “ the Table of the Lord, and not of any Al-
 “ tar, or of any *Offering* of the Bread and
 “ Wine, or any Sacrifice made to God, as
 “ upon an Altar. And this, he thinks will
 “ be found a good Argument against the
 “ things themselves.” But all this is nothing
 but a *petitio principii*, a right down begging of
 the Question, a taking of that for granted,
 which ought to be proved: For if a Sacrifice
 or Oblation of Bread and Wine be implied, in
 the Apostle’s Parallel between the Eucharist
 and the Gentile Feasts, (and he has not proved
 the contrary) then the *Table of the Lord* is pro-
 perly *the Altar of the Lord*; for that, on which
 the Bread and Wine are offered, I suppose,
 he will not deny to be truly and properly called
 an Altar. But, says he, Page 48, “ Some
 “ learned Men have objected, that in some
 “ Places of the Old Testament, the Altar in
 “ the Temple, acknowledged to be so, and
 “ almost always called so, is yet it self called
 “ a Table, (he should have said *the Table of*
 “ *the Lord*) and that therefore what St Paul
 “ calls here a Table, (he should have said *the*
 “ *Lord’s Table*) may be an Altar, notwith-
 “ standing this lower Name bestow’d upon it.”
 Well, and what has he to say to the Objection
 of these learned Men?... Why says he,
 Page

they would hold Fellowship with Devils, and so receive much Harm and Damage to their Souls? . . . He tells us, *Page 45*, “ that the
 “ Apostle’s whole Argument supposes an I-
 “ dol to be *a Nothing*; and that the Ground
 “ of the Apostle’s forbidding the Christians
 “ to eat Meats offered to Idols, was, that it
 “ would be turn’d to an ill Use by their Hea-
 “ then Neighbours. . . ” In answer to this I
 need only to observe (1) that the Apostle not
 only supposes, but expressly affirms, *ver. 20*,
 that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice,
 they sacrifice to Devils; and therefore he does
 not suppose an Idol to be *a mere Nothing*:
 (2) The Apostle expressly says, that if they
 did drink of the Cup of Devils, or were Par-
 rakers of the Table of Devils, *i. e.* if they did
 eat of such Meats as had been offered in Ho-
 nour to the Idols of the Gentiles, they would
 have *Fellowship with Devils*; and therefore he
 does not dissuade the Christians from eating
 things offered to Idols, merely because it would
 be turn’d to an ill Use by their Heathen
 Neighbours, but because by eating and drink-
 ing such Meats, they would hold Fellowship
 with Devils; they would put themselves into
 Covenant with Devils, and be out of Covenant
 with the *true God*; for that they could not
 communicate, or hold Fellowship with *both*.

And now he comes to fight Tooth and
 Nail with the Asserters of a Representative
 Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, and thinks he
 has us hard and fast, *Page 47*; because “ In
 “ this Parallel, tho’ the Apostle found Occa-
 “ sion to speak expressly of *Offerings* and Sa-
 “ crifices

“crifices made to Idols; and of the Altar in
 “the *Jewish* Temple; yet when he comes to
 “speak of the Lord’s Supper, he does not once
 “represent the *Bread* and *Wine*, as things of-
 “fered, or sacrificed upon an Altar, (which,
 “says he, he could not have avoided, had he
 “had that Notion of them) but in the plainest
 “Words, speaks of the Cup of the Lord, and
 “the Table of the Lord, and not of any Al-
 “tar, or of any *Offering* of the Bread and
 “Wine, or any Sacrifice made to God, as
 “upon an Altar. And this, he thinks will
 “be found a good Argument against the
 “things themselves.” But all this is nothing
 but a *petitio principii*, a right down begging of
 the Question, a taking of that for granted,
 which ought to be proved: For if a Sacrifice
 or Oblation of Bread and Wine be implied, in
 the Apostle’s Parallel between the Eucharist
 and the Gentile Feasts, (and he has not proved
 the contrary) then the *Table of the Lord* is pro-
 perly *the Altar of the Lord*; for that, on which
 the Bread and Wine are offered, I suppose,
 he will not deny to be truly and properly called
 an *Altar*. But, says he, *Page 48*, “Some
 “learned Men have objected, that in some
 “Places of the Old Testament, the *Altar* in
 “the Temple, acknowledged to be so, and
 “almost always called so, is yet it self called
 “a Table, (he should have said *the Table of*
 “*the Lord*) and that therefore what St Paul
 “calls here a *Table*, (he should have said *the*
 “*Lord’s Table*) may be an Altar, notwith-
 “standing this lower Name bestow’d upon it.”
 Well, and what has he to say to the Objection
 of these learned Men?.. Why says he,
Page

Page 49, " The *Jewish* Altar having been always declared an *Altar*, and yet sometimes serving the Purpose of a Table, might be sometimes called by this Name, without any Derogation from its higher Title: But the Table used in the Lord's Supper, having never been declared an Altar, nor appointed to serve any one particular Purpose of an Altar, ought to retain its own original Name. " This Argument is not good; for he asserts two Things, which ought to be proved, (1) *that the Table in the Lord's Supper has never been declared an Altar*; the contrary to which is evident from *Heb. xiii. 10.* notwithstanding what he afterwards says to the contrary, Page 96. (2) He asserts, that the Table in the Lord's Supper has never been appointed to serve any peculiar Purpose of an Altar. *Asserting is not proving*, and he only begs the Question; for if (as we have proved) the Symbols of Bread and Wine are to be offered to God, 'as the Representatives of Christ's Body and Blood, then *that* on which they are offered, not only may be, but properly is called an *Altar*; for what is the peculiar Purpose of an Altar, but to offer thereupon?

But however he thinks fit to go further into the Argument, Page 49, 50, or—rather, farther from it; and gives us a wild Parallel between the *Paschal Supper* and the *Lord's Supper*: I say, a *Wild Parallel*; for he makes the *Lord's Supper* answer to the *Paschal Supper*, not in that what is eaten in the Lord's Supper is offered to God, as that was, which was eaten in the *Paschal Supper*; but merely because in both

both there is a *commemorative* Eating. But if this be all the Agreement between them, I confess I cannot see Agreement enough to say, that the *one* answers to the *other*; for the eating in the Paschal Supper was by his own Confession, the eating of a Sacrifice; whereas, according to him, the eating in the Lord's Supper is not: The Lord's Supper therefore, according to his Notions, can no more answer to the Paschal Supper, than a Feast at College on a *Commemoration-day*, answers to it; for *one* thing is said to answer *another*, or two things are said to answer *one* the *other*, when they agree together in the *main*: But the Paschal Supper was a Feast on a *commemorative* Sacrifice; if therefore the Lord's Supper be not likewise a Feast on a *commemorative* Sacrifice; it will be an hard Matter to shew an understanding Man, wherein they do agree together so sufficiently, as that the *one* may be said to answer the *other*. But let us see what he says, "It is plain, says he, that the Lord's Supper itself answers to, and takes its Name "from the Paschal Supper." I will agree to it, and argue thus from his own Concession: The *Lord's Supper* answers to the *Paschal Supper*, but the *Paschal Supper* was a Feast upon a *commemorative* Sacrifice; therefore the *Lord's Supper* is so too: that, of which the Paschal Supper consisted (*viz.* the Lamb) was offered to God; therefore that, of which the Lord's Supper consisteth (*viz.* the Bread and Wine) are likewise to be offered to God.. "But, says he, "as the Lord's Supper answers to the Paschal Supper, so the *Lord's Table* answers to the "Table

“ Table that was spread for the partaking of
 “ that Supper.” Why so? I really can’t see
 the Consequence. If the Lord’s Supper answers
 to the Paschal Supper, that therefore the Lord’s
 Supper must be first offered to God, as the
 Paschal Supper was, is a direct Consequence ;
 but that *that*, on which the Lord’s Supper is
offered, must answer to that, on which the
 Paschal Supper *was eaten*, is no Consequence :
 Because a thing may be first offered at *one* Place,
 and then be eaten at another, as the Paschal
 Lamb was. On the other hand the direct
 Consequence is this, *viz.* the Lord’s Supper
 answers to the Paschal Supper, therefore as the
 Paschal Supper was a Feast on a Sacrifice, so
 the Lord’s Supper is a Feast on a Sacrifice ;
 and by Consequence, as the Lord’s Supper
 answers to the Paschal Supper, so *that* on which
 the Lord’s Supper is offered, answers to *that*
 on which the Paschal Supper was offered, before
 it was eaten *i. e.* the Lord’s Table answers to
 the Altar, on which (he says) the Paschal
 Lamb was offered. No, *But* says he, “ that
 “ which answers, in the Christian Dispensation,
 “ to the Paschal Lamb, is Christ himself,
 “ offered by himself on the Cross.” He should
 have said, *that which answers in the Lord’s*
Supper, &c. to make his Argument good ;
 for the Parallel is not between the Paschal
 Supper, and the *whole* Christian Dispensation,
 but between the Paschal Supper and the Lord’s
 Supper, and therefore to make his Parallel
 good, to the Paschal Lamb, of which the
 Paschal Supper consisted, he should oppose
 that, of which the Lord’s Supper consisteth.
 When he saith, *that which answers, in the*
Christian

*Christian Dispensation, to the Paschal Lamb, is Christ himself, offered by himself on the Cross: He must mean, that Christ himself offered by himself answers, either to the first original Paschal Lamb, or to the subsequent annual Paschal Lamb, which was but representative and commemorative of the first original Paschal Lamb. If he means, that Christ himself offered by himself, answers to the first original Paschal Lamb, (which I shall not dispute with him) I say it is nothing to the Purpose: For we are not now speaking of the first Original Paschal Supper, but of the subsequent, annual, commemorative Paschal Supper; and in this Sense he himself understands the Paschal Supper, Page 51; therefore I say again, to the Paschal Lamb, of which the Paschal Supper consisted, he must oppose, not Christ himself offered by himself on the Cross, but that of which the Lord's Supper consisteth; for the Parallel, by his own Confession, Page 51, is between the Lord's Supper, and the *annual, commemorative* Paschal Supper, not between the first original Paschal Supper, and the *whole* Christian Dispensation.——But if he means that Christ himself offered by himself, answers to the Paschal Lamb, in the subsequent, annual, commemorative Paschal Supper, it is not to be allowed; for this Lamb was a *commemorative* Sacrifice, representative and commemorative of the first original Lamb; but Christ himself offered by himself was an *original* Sacrifice, and not *commemorative*, or *representative* of any preceding Sacrifice. What Conclusion therefore he can draw against the representative commemorative Sacrifice in the Eucharist,*

from this Opposition between *Christ himself*, and the *Paschal Lamb*, is hard to be conceived. But let us put his Argument into Mood and Figure, and see what we can make of it. It stands thus in his own Words; *That which answers, in the Christian Dispensation; to the Paschal Lamb, is Christ himself offered by himself on the Cross: (there is his Major) But the Paschal Supper was distinct from the Sacrifice of the Lamb, and after it: (there is his Minor)* Well, what is the Consequence? why, therefore to this alone (*viz.* the Paschal Supper) it is, *that the Lord's Supper answereth.* So then, it seems we are but just where we were before, *the Lord's Supper answers to the Paschal Supper;* and if so, I say again that it is a Feast on a Sacrifice, as the Paschal Supper was a Feast on a Sacrifice. But was there ever such an *Argument*? What has the *Minor* to do with the *Major*, or the *Major* with the *Minor*? or what has the *Consequence* to do with either of them? But I suppose, by what follows in Page 50, by the *Paschal Supper*, in the *Minor* of his *Argument*, he means not the *Matter* of the Supper, *viz.* the Lamb, but the *Action* of eating it in Memory of their great Deliverance out of Egypt. Tho', by the Way, it is most unusual to use the Word *Supper*, not for the *Meat*, or *Matter* of the Supper, but for the *Action* or *Manner* of eating it. But however let us take the *Paschal Supper* in this Sense, and see how the Argument will run: *That which answers in the Christian Dispensation to the Paschal Lamb, is Christ himself offered by himself on the Cross: But the Action of eating the Paschal Supper i. e. the Lamb, was distinct from*
the

the Sacrifice of the Lamb and after it, (as you may be sure it was, for certainly they neither would nor could offer it, after they had eaten it) Therefore to this Action alone of eating the Paschal Lamb, in Memory of their great Deliverance out of Egypt, it is that the Lord's Supper answereth: i. e. (to make Sense of the Conclusion) the Action of eating the Lord's Supper, in Memory of our great Deliverance by Christ: For tho' one Thing may answer to another Thing, or the Manner of doing one Thing, may answer to the Manner of doing another Thing; yet it is not to be conceived how one Thing, that is to be eaten, can answer, not to another Thing that is also to be eaten, but merely to the Manner of eating that other Thing: Therefore I say, if he draws any Conclusion from his Premises, it must be this, viz. Therefore to this Action alone of eating the Paschal Lamb in Memory of their great Deliverance out of Egypt, it is, that the Action of eating the Lord's Supper (i. e. the Bread and Wine) answereth. And if so, I say still, to make the Lord's Supper answer to the Paschal Supper, as what was eaten in the Paschal Supper was first offered to God, so what is eaten in the Lord's Supper must be first offered to God. So that let him take which Conclusion, he pleaseth, either of them makes against himself; tho' in Truth neither of the two Conclusions do, by any means follow from his Premises. No Conclusion either for or against the Lord's Supper, can be drawn from his Premises; for in the Major he speaketh nothing of the Lord's Supper; in the Minor he speaketh nothing of it; and how then can any Conclusion be drawn

G 2

concerning

concerning the Lord's Supper, from such Premises as speak nothing of it? O *Ingenium Aristotelicum!* On the other hand, if his Premises to conclude any thing, I appeal to any Reasonable Man, that knows any thing of the Nature of an Argument, whether they do not in their plain Sense conclude thus much, *viz.*

“ That which answers in the Christian Dispensation, to the Paschal Lamb, is Christ himself offered by himself on the Cross: But the Paschal Supper was distinct from the Sacrifice of the Lamb, and after it: Therefore the Christian Dispensation is distinct from the Sacrifice of Christ himself offered by himself on the Cross, and after it.”

I say, I appeal to every Reasonable Man, whether, if his Premises will bear any Conclusion, this be not the *natural*, and the only one. Now this Conclusion must either mean, *that the Christian Dispensation was founded on the Sacrifice of himself*, and did not take Place till after his Death determin'd and accepted in God's Foreknowledge and Appointment; and in this Sense it is true: Or else it must mean (and that seems to be the natural Sense of it, according to the run of the Argument) *That as the Paschal Supper did not take place, till after the Lamb was actually offered, so the Christian Dispensation did not take place, till after Christ was actually offered.* But if by the Christian Dispensation, we understand the Covenant of Grace in general, God's Manner of saving Men, by Virtue of the Sacrifice of Christ, (and in this Sense we ought to understand it) then the Conclusion is not true; for Men were from the Beginning saved by Virtue of Christ's Death, before

before he *actually* died, as well as since his Death; the Virtue and Merits of his Death reaching backwards and forwards to all Ages of the World, it being certain in God's Foreknowledge and Appointment; upon which Account Christ is said to be *the Lamb of God, slain* (in God's Foreknowledge and Appointment) *from the Foundation of the World.*

But what has this to do with our present Subject, *the Lord's Supper*? Our Author indeed thinks his Premises do conclude something concerning the Lord's Supper; and therefore he goes on thus, "*And consequently, as the Lord's Supper answers not to the Sacrifice of the Lamb, (which he has not proved) but to the commemorative Supper, celebrated by the Jews after that Sacrifice, (I add, and upon that Sacrifice) so the Lord's Table does not come in the Place of the Altar, on which the Lamb was sacrificed, but of that Table upon which the Paschal Supper was put in order to be eaten.*" Observe, he grants that the *Lord's Supper* answers to the *Commemorative Supper*; but that commemorative Supper was a Feast upon a Sacrifice, therefore I say again, the Lord's Supper must be a Feast upon a Sacrifice; to make the *one* answer to the *other*. And if the Lord's Supper be a Feast on a Sacrifice, then the Lord's Table, on which that Sacrifice of Bread and Wine is offered, is the Lord's *Altar*.

Our Author goes on p. 51, and tells us, what he has been arguing will be plainer still, if we consider what it was amongst the Heathens, that the Table of the Lord answers to, throughout

“ throughout *St Paul's* Argument, in *Cor. x.*
 “ The *Table* of the *Lord*, says he, is not once
 “ put in Opposition to the *Altars*, upon which
 “ the Heathen Sacrifices were offered; but
 “ to those *Tables* upon which, at a Distance
 “ from the *Altars*, in other Parts of their Tem-
 “ ples, (nay perhaps at their own Houses)
 “ their Entertainment was put, and at which
 “ their Feast, in Honour to their Idols, was cele-
 “ brated:” from hence he concludes the *Table*
 of the *Lord* cannot be an *Altar*, and by
 Consequence there is no Sacrifice in the *Lord's*
 Supper; as if a Sacrifice of Bread and Wine
 could not be a Sacrifice, because it is eaten
 from off the very *Altar* on which it is offered.
 But this Argument is, with Submission, very
 weak and trifling: For the Opposition in the
 Apostle's Argument lies not barely between
 the *Table of the Lord* and the *Table of Devils*, ab-
 stracted from what was eaten at or from those
 Tables; but the Opposition is plainly between
 the Meat eaten at the *Table of Devils*, and the
 Meat eaten at the *Table of the Lord*: Now
 (as it is allowed) the Meat eaten at or from the
Table of Devils, is Meat offered to the Honour
 of Idols, so the Meat eaten at or from the *Table*
 of the *Lord*, must, by the Opposition, be Meat
 offered to the Honour of the true God; and con-
 sequently that whereon this Meat is offered is
 rightly called an *Altar*. His Argument therefore
 proves nothing against the Oblation of Bread
 and Wine in the *Lord's* Supper, being impli-
 ed in the Apostle's Opposition; even altho'
 it should be granted, that the Gentiles eat
 their Sacrifices on Tables, at a Distance from
 the *Altars*: But the Reader may be pleas'd
 to

to observe, “ that the Heathens not only eat
 “ their Altar-offerings at their Holy Tables,
 “ but often offered upon them, especially their
 “ Meat and Drink-offerings, upon which they
 “ feasted with their Priests, in Honour of their
 “ Gods.” See *Hickes’s Christian Priesthood, Vol. I.*
p. 75, 76. And I desire the Reader withall to
 take Notice, that the Lord’s Table is, and may
 be properly called a *Table* as well as an *Altar*:
 it is an Altar with Respect to the Oblation of
 Bread and Wine, offered to God, as the Re-
 presentatives of Christ’s Body and Blood; and
 it is a Table, with Respect to the Eating, or
 Participation of that Oblation.

Our Author goes on, *Page 52*, to give us
 another Argument, but it is an Argument
 drawn from his own Hypothesis; for thus he
 argues: This Rite (*viz.* the Lord’s Supper)
 consists in eating and drinking Bread and Wine
 (neither offered to God, nor blessed by the
 Life-giving Spirit) “ in Remembrance of his
 “ Body broken, and Blood shed:” from hence
 he concludes, “ that there is no need of an
 “ Altar, for this Sort of commemorative Eat-
 “ ing and Drinking.” But we have already
 proved, that Christ commanded and commis-
 sioned his Apostles to offer Bread and Wine
 to God, as Figures of his Body and Blood;
 and therefore I say again, that *that* on which
 this Oblation of Bread and Wine is made, not
 only may be, but properly is called an *Altar*.
 What follows, *Page 54*, if it concludes any
 thing, it concludes against the Popish Doc-
 trine of offering to God in the Eucharist, the
 very natural Flesh and Blood of Christ, not
 against

against the Assertors of a Representative Sacrifice, under the Symbols of Bread and Wine. Tho' indeed I cannot answer for any one Sentence in the whole Page; as particularly, when he asserts, " that the only thing in the
 " Christian Dispensation, which answers to
 " any of the legal Sacrifices, but indeed is
 " far more excellent in its Nature and Design
 " than them all, is the Death of Christ." I desire the Reader to consider, that all the legal Sacrifices (in the Judgment of all sound Divines, antient and modern) were no farther acceptable to God, than as they were consider'd by him, as Representations of the grand Sacrifice of Christ's Death, and as they were *Pleadings* of the Covenant, founded on the Priesthood and Sacrifice of Christ; whereas, on the contrary, the personal Sacrifice of Christ was not *Representative* of any other Sacrifice, but acceptable to God by its *own intrinsic* Worth and Excellency; it was not the *Pleading*, but the *Foundation*, or *Procurement*, as well as the *Sanction* of the New Covenant: these things being duly consider'd, I shall leave it to the judicious Reader to determine, *how far* it may be allowable to say, that the *personal* Sacrifice of Christ *answers* to any of the *legal* Sacrifices, or whether such a Way of speaking be at all allowable. He asserts, " that the
 " only Person, who answers to any *Jewish*
 " Priest, consider'd as a *Sacrificer*, is *Jesus*
 " *Christ* himself, who offered himself up." But we have proved that Christ commission'd his Apostles, and in them, their Successors and Substitutes, *to offer a Representative Sacrifice*; therefore his Assertion is groundless.

He

He likewise asserts, *that Christ offered himself on the Cross.* I desire the Reader to take Notice, that Christ did not, properly speaking, offer himself *on* the Cross. Under the Law the Sacrifice was offered to God, before it was slain, tho' the Oblation was not *finished* till after it was, the Atonement being made by the Blood of the slain Animal. So Christ offered himself to God, *i. e.* resign'd himself to God, to be slain on the Cross, before he was fastened to the Cross: He solemnly offered himself to God, under the Pledges of Bread and Wine in the Eucharist; for when he administered the Bread to the Apostles, he did expressly declare this Bread to be his Body *given*, or *offered* for them: and when he administered the Cup, that this was *his Blood shed for them*: He says as directly, and as strongly as Words can express a Thing, that he did then give or offer to God his Body and Blood. See the Introduction of Vol. II. of *Johnson's Unbloody Sacrifice*.—Christ therefore did not, properly speaking, *offer himself on* the Cross; tho' he was (as a Sacrifice) slain on the Cross, and this Sacrifice was not, properly speaking, finished, not only till after he was so slain, but even not till after he was ascended into the Presence of God.

But to proceed, our Author is willing to have it believed, *Page 55*, that many of the Greek Fathers and Commentators, did not believe a true (*i. e.* material) and Representative Sacrifice in the Eucharist, altho' in the Beginning of his Book, he had told us, *it is of small Importance to know*, what any of them have said on this Subject. “Many, says he, of

H

“ the

“ the Greek Fathers and Commentators—
 “ tho’ amongst other high Words, they often
 “ called this Rite a *Sacrifice*; yet they could
 “ not forbear sometimes to correct this Ex-
 “ pression, and to declare, they did not mean
 “ a *Sacrifice*, properly speaking, but only the
 “ *Remembrance* of a *Sacrifice*.” Particularly
 St Chrysostom Hom. 17. in *Epist. ad Hebr.* af-
 ter he had said Θυσίαν ποιῶμεν, he adds, μᾶλλον
 δε ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας: which is in Ef-
 fect to say, “ I call it a *Sacrifice*; but indeed,
 “ it is not a *Sacrifice*, but the *Remembrance* of
 “ a *Sacrifice*.”

Now Reader, I pray you take Notice, here
 is not only an *unfair* Quotation, but also, to
 say no worse of it, an *unfair* Construction.
 St Chrysostom’s Words are τὴν αὐτὴν θυσίαν αἰεὶ
 * ποιῶμεν, (whether this be a wilful Mistake, I will
 not determine, but surely it looks like it); *We*
offer always the same Sacrifice (viz. the Sacri-
 fice that Christ offered, for of that he had
 been speaking) or rather *we make* (or offer, for
 ἐργαζόμεθα is a sacrificial Term, see 1 Cor.
 ix. 13.) a *Memorial of the Sacrifice*: Now that
 this *Memorial ἀνάμνησις*, was made by offering
 the Bread and Wine to God, as Representa-
 tions of Christ’s Body and Blood, none of the
 Antients is more express than St Chrysostom.
 St Chrysostom’s plain Meaning is, “ that they
 “ offered the *Sacrifice*, which Christ made of
 “ his own Body and Blood, by Representation:”
 they made a Memorial of the grand Sacrifice,

* The Reader is desired to take Notice, that St Chry-
 sostom uses ποιῶ in the Sense of *Offering*. See *Propit.*
Ob. 69.

by offering the appointed Representatives of it: They offered Bread and Wine to God, *literally* and *truly*, but the Body and Blood of Christ, *figuratively*, and by Representation; what they offered in the Eucharist, being not *literally* but *representatively* the Body and Blood of Christ. St *Chrysostom* therefore might well say; “ we offer the same Sacrifice, or rather “ we make, or offer, a Memorial of the Sacrifice;” which is in Effect to say; “ we do not “ indeed offer the very same Sacrifice that “ Christ offered, but we make a Memorial of it “ to God, by offering the appointed Representations.”——Let the Reader judge, what Credit is to be given to one, who to maintain his Hypothesis, scruples not to give an unfair Quotation, and as unfair a Construction: Certainly he must have a bad Cause to support, who is reduced to such Shifts to maintain it. And I must needs say, it is to me Matter of Surprise, that any one should venture to assert, that the antient Fathers and the primitive Church, did not believe and practise a *true*, tho’ representative Sacrifice, that is, a *literal, material* Oblation of Bread and Wine to God, in the Holy Eucharist, as the appointed Representations and Figures of Christ’s Body and Blood; after it has been so undeniably proved, as by others, so particularly by the Reverend and Learned Mr *Johnson*, in his *Unbloody Sacrifice*, that the antient Fathers and the primitive Church actually did so believe and practice. But the antient Liturgies (which every one may now read in his Mother Tongue) is a glaring Confutation of all such Bold Assertions.

But to proceed; he goes on in the next Place, Page 59, to comment upon *Cor. xi. 20, 34,*

But as he comments upon this Passage in the same Manner, that he does upon the History of Institution, (which Comment of his we have already considered and confuted) I shall pass it by. But I may not overlook his Notion of *worthy* and *unworthy* Receiving. He tells us, “ that he who performs this Duty *suitably* to the End of it, cannot be said to “ perform it *unworthily*.” And so say I. But as He and I differ in our Notions of the *Nature* and *End* of this Ordinance, so of Consequence, we must differ in our Notions of performing this Duty, *suitably* to the End of it, and therefore in our Notions of performing it *worthily* and *unworthily*. By a Christian’s performing this Duty *suitably* to the End of it, he means no more, *Page 77, 79, than his Remembering of Christ’s Body broken, and his Blood shed, at the same time of eating and drinking; or his eating and drinking with a serious Remembrance of his Master*: Insomuch that he does plainly declare, and takes a great deal of Pains to prove it, *Pages 81, 83, 85, 88*, that a Man may be a wilful, habitual Sinner, and yet perform this Duty aright, if he does but *seriously* remember Christ’s Body broken, and his Blood shed, at the Time of his eating and drinking: Now it must be own’d, that this is consistent with, and naturally follows from his Hypothesis, which is, “ that the *whole* of the Duty “ consists in eating Bread broken, and drinking “ *Wine*, with a serious Remembrance of *Christ*,” for to be sure, if the whole Nature and End of this Ordinance, consists in eating and drinking Bread and Wine with a serious Remembrance of Christ, he who does so eat and drink

Bread

Bread and Wine, performs the Duty *suitably* to the Nature and End of it, whatever he may be in other Respects: But if this Hypothesis be wrong, (as we have proved it to be) then all Consequences drawn from it are so too. I shall therefore on the other hand, desire the serious Reader to take Notice in few Words, that if our Notion of the Nature and End of this Institution be right, (and I hope it has been proved to be so) *viz.* “ that the Lord’s
 “ Supper is a Feast upon a Sacrifice of Bread
 “ and Wine, which have been offered to God,
 “ as the Figures of Christ’s Body and Blood,
 “ to engage him to remember the grand Sa-
 “ crifice, to move him to be gracious and
 “ merciful to his Church and People, in ap-
 “ plying and confirming to us the Benefits of
 “ the New Covenant, founded on the Priest-
 “ hood and Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, *viz.*
 “ Pardon, Grace, and Happiness:” I say if this be the true Notion of the Lord’s Supper; why then no wilful, habitual Sinner (continuing such) can attend this Sacrifice, or feed upon the Holy Symbols *suitably* to the End of this Institution, and consequently every such wilful, habitual Sinner eats and drinks unworthily: And that for this plain Reason, because a wilful, habitual Sinner (continuing such) is not a qualify’d Object for God’s Pardon, according to the Tenour of the Covenant; he has no Right, while he continues so, to the pleading of the Covenant, and by Consequence can receive no Benefit from an Oblation, or representative Sacrifice, made to God, for the procuring from him the Effects and Purchase of the Sacrifice of Christ; that
 is,

is, for the Pardon of Sin, and for applying and confirming to us the other Benefits of the New Covenant. The End of the Christian Oblation in the Holy Eucharist, is to procure Pardon, and the other Benefits purchased by the grand Sacrifice; but no wilful, habitual Sinner is entituled to Pardon; and therefore if he dares to join in this Holy Ordinance, he prophanes it, and will find himself answerable to God for his great Impiety.——

I say therefore, to attend this Holy Ordinance, and to eat and drink the holy Symbols *suitably* to this Holy Ordinance, is to attend it, and to eat and drink with *penitent* Hearts and *pure* Affections; without which we do not attend this Ordinance *suitably* to the End of it; which is to procure Pardon, and the Influence of divine Grace; to which we are not entituled, and which we cannot receive without *penitent* Hearts and *pure* Affections.

Our Author goes on, *Page 94*, to object against, and gloss upon, some other Passages in the New Testament, which the Asserters of a Representative Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, do alledge to relate to it.——

But whether the following Passages relate to the *Sacrament of the Altar*, or not; the Doctrine of a Representative Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, will, I hope, appear to the impartial Reader to be well grounded, from what has been already said in Vindication of it. But however, it may not be amiss to consider what he has objected to these Passages, as understood by us to relate to the Eucharist.

These

These Words, says he, 1 Cor. v. 8. *Christ our Passover, &c.* He would have done well to have given his Reader the entire Passage, which runs thus, *Purge out therefore the old Leaven, that ye may be a new Lump, as ye are unleaven'd. For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the Feast, not with old Leaven, neither with the Leaven of Malice and Wickedness; but with the unleavened Bread of Sincerity and Truth.* “These Words,” says he, supposing them to relate (as some “have imagined) to the *Lord's Supper*, instituted in Remembrance of our *Paschal Lamb*, “only teach us, that we ought to partake of “*this*, which is our *Paschal Feast* (*which by the “Way, was a Feast on a Sacrifice*) with such “sincere, untainted, honest Hearts, as become Christians.” Now I appeal to every impartial Man, that will attentively read the Passage, whether, supposing the Apostle to speak of the *Lord's Supper*, he does not plainly speak of it, as of a Sacrifice, in which *Christ is sacrificed* or offered for us, offered for us *representatively*, in the appointed Representations and Memorials of his Body and Blood. The Apostle bids the *Corinthians*, *purge out the old Leaven*, that is, cast out the incestuous Person (see ver. 5.) *because even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us*, therefore, says he, *let us keep the Feast, not with the old Leaven, neither with the Leaven of Malice, &c.* The *Feast*, of which the Apostle speaketh is plainly the *Feast of the Eucharist*; for he speaketh of something to be eaten, as the *Paschal Supper* was eaten; but that which answers to the *Paschal Supper* is, by our Author's own Confession,

feſſion, the *Lord's Supper*. The Sum there-
 fore of the Apoſtle's Command is, that they
 ſhould exclude the *Inceſtuous Perſon*, and keep
 themſelves as free from all *Wickedneſs*, when
 they celebrated the *Lord's Supper*, as the Jews
 were obliged to keep themſelves free from all
Leaven, when they celebrated the annual *Paf-
 chal Supper*. But ſays our Author, "Whoe-
 ver reads the preceding Verſes, as directed
 "to the *Corinthians*, will ſee, that they relate
 "to their conſtant Behaviour, as a Society of
 "Chriſtians, deſigned by their Holy Religion
 "to be purged from all *Leaven*, or every
 "thing that could corrupt them." And to
 prove this, he repreſents the Apoſtle arguing
 thus, *Page 95*, "As Chriſt might be called
 "our *Pafchal Lamb*, ſo a Society of Chriſtians
 "keeping (as it were) a perpetual *Feaſt*, under
 "the Senſe of their Deliverance, and of the
 "Love of their *Deliverer*, ſhould be always
 "as free from the *Leaven* of Wickedneſs, and
 "keep themſelves as clear from the Danger
 "of it, by not committing or ſuffering it a-
 "mong them, as the Jews were required to
 "be free from all *Leaven* in the *Pafchal Sup-
 per*, which they annually celebrated in Re-
 "membrance of their Deliverance out of *E-
 gypt*." Reader obſerve the *As* and *So*: If
 he ſuppoſes the Apoſtle to mean, that the per-
 ſonal Sacrifice of Chriſt answers to the *Original*
Pafchal Lamb; then the Argument fails, be-
 cauſe, at this Rate of arguing, the *annual comme-
 morative Pafchal Supper*, in the latter Part of the
 Argument is made to be the ſame as the *Original*
Pafchal Lamb, in the former Part of it, which
 cannot be. On the other hand, if he ſuppoſes
 the

the Apostle to mean, that the *Personal* Sacrifice of Christ answers to the *annual, commemorative* Paschal Lamb, this we have shewn Page 41, to be not true. So that, for any thing our Author has said to the contrary, the Apostle in this Passage appears to intend the *Lord's Supper*; and if he does, he plainly speaks of it as of a *Sacrifice*, in which Christ is *representatively sacrificed*, or offered, under the *appointed* Symbols, or Memorials of his Body and Blood.

Page 96, Some again, says he, have applied to this *Sacrament* the Text, *Heb. xiii. 10.* *We* (We Christians) *have an Altar, whereof* [or from which,] *they have no Right to eat, who serve the Tabernacle.* He is pleas'd to assert, "that there is not one Interpreter, antient or modern, who interprets this obscure Passage *of the Lord's Table.*" Now it is certain, that among the Antients, *Theodoret, Oecumenius, and Theophylact*, do all understand this Text in a literal Sense of a *proper Altar* in the Christian Church; and if we have an *Altar*, by Consequence we must have a *Sacrifice*, and *Priests* to offer that Sacrifice. But these, in our Author's Judgment, are Interpreters of *no Note*: But why then does he himself, Page 33, quote *Theophylact*? When he thinks that he will serve his Purpose, it seems that *Theophylact* is an Interpreter good enough to be follow'd. They who understand this Text of a *proper Altar* in the Christian Church, and consequently of a real, *material* Sacrifice, to be offered on this *Altar*, say thus much for themselves; viz.

I

" that

“that the Holy Apostle having shew’d at
 “large in this Epistle to the *Hebrews*, that the
 “Law of *Moses* is antiquated, and the Obliga-
 “tion of it entirely abolished since the Coming
 “of Christ, *the Mediator of a better Covenant* :”

Left they should from hence infer, that there
 is no more Priesthood upon Earth, no more
 Sacrifice, no more Altar, and consequently
 no Rites and Ordinances of Religious Wor-
 ship, he lets them know in the Text, now un-
 der Consideration, that *we have an Altar*, but
 such an one, *whereof they have no Right to eat*,
who serve the Tabernacle, i. e. the Jews, who
 were God’s chosen People, yet had no Right
 to eat of the Christian Sacrifice, because it is
 such a Sacrifice, (viz. a *Sin-offering*) as by their
 own Law they were not permitted to eat of:

As plainly appears from the very next Words;
*For the Bodies of those Beasts whose Blood is brought
 into the Sanctuary by the High Priest, for Sin,
 are burnt without the Camp.* By which Words
 he proves what he had asserted in the foregoing
 Verse, that *they which serve the Tabernacle had
 no Right to eat of our Altar*: because by their
 own Law, no one was to eat Part of a *Sin-of-
 fering*, but it was to be burnt without the
 Camp. Now if the Reason why the Jews
 had no Right to eat of the Christian Altar,
 is, because they were not permitted to eat of
 a *Sin-offering*: Does not this plainly shew,
 that the Offering made on our Christian Al-
 tar, the Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist,
 is a *Sin-offering*, a *propitiatory Oblation*? And
 if so, is it not the Means of procuring Pardon
 for Sin? I pray you, Reader, take Notice
 of

of this, because our Author denies (*Page 144*) that Pardon of Sin is to be had *in*, or *by* the Lord's Supper. I likewise pray the Reader to take Notice, that the Apostle, by *eating off* or from the Christian Altar, means eating *orally* (*i. e.* with the Mouth) a material Sacrifice; because he says the Jews had no Right to *eat* of the Christian Altar, because by their own Law they were not to *eat* of a Sin-offering. If he means an oral Eating (*i. e.* with the Mouth) in the one Case, manifest it is that he must mean the same in the other: But we have no Sacrifice in the Christian Church, that can be eaten *orally*, (*i. e.* with the Mouth) but the Sacrifice of the Eucharist alone, the Sacrifice of Bread and Wine, as the Representations of Christ's Body and Blood, which is such a Sacrifice as the Jews had no Right to eat of, because they were not permitted to eat of a *Sin-offering*; where the Apostle at once asserts the Christian *Sacrifice* of the Eucharist, and withal that it is a *Sin-offering*, a propitiatory Oblation, to procure Pardon by Virtue of the grand Sacrifice, of which it is an appointed Representation.

But this plain Construction of the Text, our Author will by no Means allow: But what then does he say is the Meaning of it? Why that he cannot well tell. He says it is an *obscure* Passage, and it may signify *this* thing, or it may signify *that* thing; and I add, it *may* and does signify neither. "The general Meaning, (says he, *Page 97*,) of this Passage *may be* (*and it may not be*) That no one can receive any Benefit from Christ crucify'd, or from the Doctrine of the

“ Cross, upon which Christ offered himself,
 “ who still adheres to the Jewish Dispensation.”
 So that by the Altar which the Apostle speaks
 of, he understands *Christ crucified*, or *the Do-*
ctrine of the Cross, and by eating off or from this
 Altar, he understands *receiving Benefit from*
Christ crucified, or *from the Doctrine of the Cross*:
 But I pray you Reader, to observe that the A-
 postle speaks of eating *orally*, *i. e.* with the
 Mouth: But very Christ crucified cannot be
orally eaten, the Doctrine of the Cross cannot
 be *orally* eaten, nor can the Benefit of Christ
 crucified be *orally* eaten. In Page 98, he tells
 us, “ that indeed if we will enter more nicely
 “ into the exact Meaning of the Apostle’s pe-
 “ culiar Argument in this Verse,” we shall find
 it to be only an Argument *ad hominem*;
 and then gives us a Comment, which whoever
 reads with Attention, will find, that he makes
 the Apostle to have that in his *Conclusion* which
 was not in his *Premises*; and withal he begs the
 Question, by taking it for granted p. 99, “ that
 “ by eating of the Christian Altar, is meant parta-
 “ king of the Benefits of Christ’s Death:” Whereas
 the Apostle plainly speaks of an *oral* Eating,
 which cannot be applied to the Benefits of
 Christ’s Death: But says he, “ something
 “ like this (*viz.* the forementioned Comments)
 “ must be the Meaning of this obscure Passage.”
 If this Passage be *obscure*, it is because the old
 Proverb takes Place, *None so blind as they who*
will not see. And till such time as our Author
 shall be pleas’d to determine what is the actual
 Meaning of this Text, the impartial Reader,
 I am persuaded, will be strongly inclined

to believe the plain, natural, primitive Sense of it, to be the true one*.

The next Passage of Scripture, that comes under his Consideration, is our Saviours Discourse about *eating his Flesh* and drinking his *Blood*, in the vith Chapter of St *John's* Gospel. This Discourse, he says, relates not to the *Lord's Supper*, but to our Lord's *Doctrine*. Well then, let us see what he has to object against understanding this Discourse, to relate to the Lord's Supper.

In the first Place he objects, *Page 100, That there is no Appearance, that this Passage was understood in the very first Days of the Church, to concern this Rite, viz. the Lord's Supper.* Now this, to say no worse of it, is a downright Imposition upon the Reader; for that the primitive Church did constantly understand our Saviour, in this Discourse, to mean his Sacramental Body and Blood, that which is his Body and Blood in Power and Effect, by his own Institution and Appointment, and by the real, tho' invisible Power of the Holy Ghost: that this was the general Consent of the antient Fathers, and the primitive Church, has been most convincingly proved by the Learned and Reverend Mr *Johnson*, in his *Unbloody Sacrifice*; where the Reader will find the Point in hand most evidently proved, and all Objections that can be raised to the contrary most undeniably confuted. And that our

* The Learned Mr *Mede*, in his Discourse concerning the Name *Altar*, has shewn, that by the *Altar* mentioned *Heb. xiii. 10.* may very well be understood the *Lord's Table*.

own Church understands our Saviour's Discourse, of his *Sacramental Body and Blood*, is plain from several Expressions in our Communion-Office, as in the Exhortation, *for then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood, &c.* and again, *Grant us so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son, and to drink his Blood, &c.* which Expressions any one, at first Sight, may see to allude to what our Saviour says, *Who so eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last Day; for my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed.*

In the second Place, our Author objects, that *this Discourse could not relate to a Duty, which was not then instituted, nor so much as hinted at to his Disciples.* I pray you Reader, observe how he begs the Question: He says, that *eating Christ's Sacramental Body and Blood, was not so much as [hinted] at to the Disciples, in this Discourse.* This I say is begging the Question; asserting, not proving, that Christ does not speak of his Sacramental Body and Blood; whereas the very Question is, whether he does, or does not speak thereof. So that our Author's Argument runs thus, *Our Lord, in this Discourse, does not speak of eating and drinking his Sacramental Body and Blood: But why does he not? Why, because he does not so much as hint at it. i. e. he does not speak of his Sacramental Body and Blood, because he does not speak of it.* A fine Reason! O Acumen! But says our Author, "this Discourse could not relate to a Duty, which was not then instituted." But why so, I pray? Could not our Lord tell them, that he would

would hereafter appoint something to be eaten and drunk by his Followers, under the Name and Title of his Flesh and Blood? Nay does he not expressly tell them, that he would do so? He speaks plainly in the Future Tense, *Labour for that Meat* (*viz.* that which he afterwards calls his Flesh and Blood), *which* saith he, *the Son of Man SHALL give unto you.* Our Author's Objection therefore is founded upon a *false Supposition*, as if our Lord had spoken of eating his Flesh and drinking his Blood *out of hand*: Whereas our Lord requires nothing to be done out of hand, but to believe in the Promise which he gave them of making his Flesh to be Meat indeed, and his Blood to be Drink indeed; and expresses himself in the Future Tense, when he speaks of his Sacramental Body and Blood, as of the *Meat, which the Son of Man SHALL give, ver. 27.* and says, *the Bread which I SHALL give, is my Flesh, ver. 51.* This is an evident Demonstration, that he did not speak of eating his Flesh, as of a thing to be done *forthwith*, or *out of hand*, at the very time that he spoke to them: But that he intended, some time afterwards, to appoint something to be eaten and drunk, under the Name and Title of his Flesh and Blood, which it would then be the Duty of his Followers to eat and drink, when he should have *actually* appointed it to be eaten and drunk.

His next Objection, *Page 101*, is drawn
 “ from the Difference of Expression, in this
 “ Discourse, and in the Institution of the
 “ Lord's Supper. In the Institution, says he,
 “ of the Lord's Supper, our Saviour says,
 “ *the*

“ *the Bread which you are to eat, is my Body;*
 “ *not, my Body, or Flesh, is your Bread, or*
 “ *your Food.*” To shew the Vanity of this
 Objection, I need only desire the Reader to
 observe, that if the *Bread* in the *Lord’s Sup-*
per, be *Christ’s Sacramental Body*, why, then
 his *Sacramental Body* is the *Bread* which we
 are to eat.

His last Objection, *Page 102*, is drawn
 from his own Comment upon the 63d Verse,
 which he explains thus; “ the Words which
 “ I speak unto you, the *Doctrines* I teach, for
 “ which I shall suffer in the *Flesh*, and which
 “ I shall seal with my Blood: These are the
 “ things I mean, which I have talked of, un-
 “ der the Notion of Meat and Drink, to nou-
 “ rish you to eternal Life. *These Words*, are
 “ *Spirit*, and these are the *Life*, I have been
 “ speaking of; and These, if you will re-
 “ ceive them, shall be *Vital Food* to you.
 “ A Manner of Explication, which our Blessed
 “ Lord could not (I humbly presume) have
 “ made use of; had he ever design’d this Dis-
 “ course to be understood of his future Institu-
 “ tion of the *Lord’s Supper*:” He is certainly
 very right; for to be sure, if our Lord spake of
 nothing, but of his *Doctrines*, he did not speak
 of the *Lord’s Supper*. But let us see what
 Foundation this Comment of his rests upon:
 Our Lord says, *the Words that I speak unto*
you, they are Spirit, and they are Life; which
 our Author explains thus, *The Doctrines that I*
teach, are the Things, which I have talked of
under the Notion of Meat and Drink; he should
 have said, *under the Notion of my Flesh and*
Blood;

Blood; for he owns that our Saviour explains in these Words, what he meant by his *Flesh* and *Blood*. Now this Comment has not the least Foundation to rest upon. Our Saviour does not say, *the Words that I speak unto you*, (*i. e.* in our Author's Sense, the Doctrines I teach) *are the Flesh and Blood*, that I have been speaking of. No, he says no such thing; but he says thus, *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing: The Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life.* Our Author himself owns, that these Words are an Explanation of what our Lord called his *Flesh* and *Blood*. Now our Lord having said, *ver. 54. Whoso eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, hath Eternal Life*, and having said likewise, *ver. 33, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you*, and they being stagger'd at this, grossly imagining that he had spoke of his very *natural* *Flesh* and *Blood*, he lets them know, *ver. 62.* that his *natural* *Flesh* and *Blood* should ascend into Heaven, and then, *ver. 63.* he explains to them, as far as he saw proper, the Nature of that, which he had called his *Flesh* and *Blood*: *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing*: " As if he had said, I have told you
 " that whoso eateth my *Flesh* and drinketh my
 " *Blood* hath eternal Life, and that without eat-
 " ing my *Flesh* and drinking my *Blood*, ye have
 " no Life; you grossly imagine, that I mean
 " eating and drinking my *natural* *Flesh* and
 " *Blood*; but consider, it is the *Spirit* that
 " giveth Life, my *Flesh*, whether *literally* or

K

" repre-

“ representatively eaten, would not avail to
 “ the Purpose of giving Life, without the
 “ Spirit; you may be sure therefore, that
 “ what I have been speaking of, as my Flesh
 “ and Blood, is something that shall be so,
 “ in Power and Effect, by the Power and
 “ Communication of the Life-giving Spi-
 “ rit.” Our Lord does not say, “ My *Doc-*
 “ *trines* are the Flesh and Blood I have been
 “ speaking of;” but “ the Words that I
 “ speak unto you, they are Spirit and they
 “ are Life;” *i. e.* I speak of something that
 shall be my Body and Blood in Power and
 Effect, by the Blessing and Presence of the
 Life-giving Spirit.

By this time I suppose my Reader may have
 enough of our Author's Manner of explaining
 (away the plain, natural Sense of) Scripture,
 I pass on therefore in the third Place—to
 shew how much he has misrepresented the
 Doctrine of our Church, and how roughly
 he has handled our Communion-Office.

Page 57, He says, “ I shall only add,
 “ that (in perfect Agreement with what I
 “ have now said, *against the Doctrine of a Re-*
 “ *presentative Sacrifice*) throughout the esta-
 “ blish'd Rules, and *authentic* Rubrics of our
 “ Church, whenever there is Occasion to
 “ speak upon this Subject, the Name constantly
 “ made use of is the *Communion-Table*, or sim-
 “ ply, *the Table*; never *Altar*.” Well, and
 what then, does it follow from hence, that our
 Church denies the *Representative Sacrifice*, be-
 cause the Lord's Table (which is another
 Name for his *Altar*) is not expressly called the
Altar? May it not be a *Table* and an *Altar* too,

as I have already observed? Yes, certainly it may! And so it certainly is, according to the Doctrine and Practice of our Church. For I would ask our Author, what is the Use of an *Altar*, but to receive the *Oblations* made to the true God? Now is not this Use made of the Communion-Table by our Church? Yes certainly it is. For is not the Priest required, when he has humbly *presented* and *placed* the *Alms* upon the *Holy Table*; I say, is he not required *then* to *place* upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient? And when he has done this, is he not required to beseech God to accept, not only the *Alms* which he had *presented* and placed upon the Holy Table, but also the *Oblations* which he had also, but the moment before, placed thereon. Now it is evidently plain that the *Oblations* are the *Bread* and *Wine*, and therefore the Holy Table on which these *Oblations* are placed, or offered by the Priest, is in the Account, and according to the *enjoined* Practice of our Church an *Altar*; for an *Altar* of the true God is that on which *Oblations* are made to the true God. See the *Rubric* before the Prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church.

Page 108, he tells his Reader, "that he
 "shall enter more particularly into the several *Parts* and *Prayers*, that compose our
 "Communion-Office, in order both to interpret such *Passages* (relating to this Institution) as may stand in need of *Interpretation*,
 "and to lead all Persons concern'd, to make use of it, in the most proper and *Christian*
 "Manner. The Communion-Office, says he
 "Page 109, begins with Sentences, relating
 "chiefly

“ chiefly to the Duty of Beneficence to all
 “ Men, by our *Alms* and charitable Contri-
 “ butions. It proceeds, says he, to the
 “ Charity and Assistance of our united *Prayers*,
 “ for the good and Happiness of the whole
 “ Body of Christians. After this, says he,
 “ follows an Exhortation, &c.” I pray you
 Reader observe, here is no Notice taken of
 the Priest being enjoined to offer on God’s
 Table Bread and Wine, and then to beseech
 God to accept those *Oblations*, or Offerings of
 Bread and Wine. Is not this a willful Mis-
 representation of our Communion-Office?

In the *Exhortation* are these Words, “ Ye
 “ that mind to come to the Holy Communion of
 “ the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ;”
 These Words he explains thus, “ You, that
 “ remain in the Church, with a Design of
 “ partaking of that *Bread and Wine*, which
 “ are appointed to be *Memorials* of the Body
 “ and Blood of Christ.” If he used the Word
Memorial in the Scripture Sense of it, I should
 not object much against this Explanation: But
 let the Reader remember, that he allows of
 no *Oblation*, of no *Blessing*, and makes the
 whole Rite to consist *merely* in eating Bread
 broken, and drinking Wine, in Remembrance,
 or as he explains it, with a serious Remem-
 brance of Christ; therefore his Explanation
 amounts to no more, than if he had said,
 “ Ye that remain in the Church with a De-
 “ sign to eat mere Bread broken, and to
 “ drink Wine with a serious Remembrance of
 “ Christ’s Body and Blood.” But is this all,
 that our Church means by these Words, *Ye*
that mind to come to the Holy Communion of the
Body

Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ? Certainly the plain Meaning is, *Ye that mind to eat that Bread, which (Bread) is the Communion of the Body of Christ, and to drink that Wine, which (Wine) is the Communion of the Blood of Christ:* for the Words plainly refer to 1 Cor. x. 16. *The Cup of Blessing which (Cup) we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* In which Words, (as I have observ'd already) the Apostle does expressly determine the Bread and the Cup, to be the Communion of Christ's Body and Blood, which are made so by the Blessing and Presence of the Life-giving Spirit. To proceed in the same lifeless Manner, he explains these other Words in the Exhortation, *viz. for then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ, and drink his Blood, then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; We are one with Christ, and Christ with us.* His Explanation runs thus, Page 110; "If we come to it with such Dispositions of Mind as become Christians, &c. "We shall then with these Dispositions of Mind come to good Purpose. By our Faith, and sincere accepting him, as our Master, we shall come up to the full Meaning of that Expression in the Gospel, in which his Followers were called upon to eat his Flesh and drink his Blood; in a spiritual or religious Sense embracing his Doctrine, as the Food and Life of our Souls. We shall then be so acceptable to Christ, that we may be said (by a strong Figure of Speech) to dwell in him, and he in us; that is, that Christ and We, to all the Intents

“ Intents and Purposes of true Religion,
 “ shall be in perfect Friendship and Union
 “ together: We partaking of the good Spi-
 “ rit of his Gospel (*Reader note that Expression*),
 “ and he receiving us, and doing all good Of-
 “ fices to us, as his true Disciples and Fol-
 “ lowers.” Now this Explanation by no
 Means agrees with the Words of the Exhor-
 tation: The Exhortation plainly speaketh of
eating Christ’s Flesh and drinking his Blood, by
receiving this Sacrament; on the other hand, he
 speaks of eating Christ’s Flesh and drinking
 his Blood, not by eating and drinking in this
 Sacrament, but by *Faith*. And by eating
 Christ’s Flesh and drinking his Blood, he un-
 derstands *embracing his Doctrine*, as the *Food*
 and *Life* of our Souls: So that according to
 him, the Exhortation runs thus, “ For as
 “ the Benefit is great, if with a true penitent
 “ Heart and lively Faith, we receive that
 “ Holy Sacrament; for then we embrace
 “ Christ’s Doctrine, as the Food and Life of
 “ our Souls.” But we have already proved,
 that by eating and drinking his Flesh and
 Blood, Christ means, eating and drinking his
Sacramental Body and Blood, that which is
 his Body and Blood in Power and Effect, by
 Means of the Blessing and Presence of the
 Life-giving Spirit: And a Man must first
embrace Christ’s Doctrine, before he can receive
 this Holy Sacrament to his real Comfort and
 Advantage. So that our Author’s Explana-
 tion, to say the best of it, is vastly wide of
 the Purpose. The plain Sense and Meaning
 of our Church in those Words, is undoubtedly
 this; *then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ*
and

and drink his Blood, i. e. as we eat and drink in a worthy Manner, so we eat and drink to our Souls great Advantage, that which is Christ's Body and Blood in Power and Effect, by means of the Power of the Life-giving Spirit, going along with it: *Then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us: We are one with him, and Christ with us*, by means of the one Spirit communicated to us.

The Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ, are in this Exhortation called *Holy Mysteries*: "Not in the common Sense of the Word, (says our Author, *Page 113*) as it has been used to signify either a thing *Incomprehensible* to our Understandings, or a Matter still hidden from us." But I must beg leave to observe, that the *Sacramental Body* and Blood of Christ are made his *Body* and *Blood* in Power and Effect, by the *Real*, tho' *Invisible*, Power and Communication of the Life-giving Spirit: Which because it is not to be perceived by the outward Senses, and because we know not the Manner, how the Spirit is *Invisibly*, but *Really*, present to render the Holy Symbols, the Spiritual Body and Blood of Christ, therefore upon these Accounts the Church of *England*, (as did the primitive Church) calls the Holy Symbols, *Holy Mysteries*.

And whereas our Author is pleas'd to assert *Page 77, 79*, "that he who eats and drinks with a serious Remembrance of Christ, his Master, performs this Duty *worthily*, i. e. suitably to the End and Design of it;" yea and takes a great deal of Pains, *Page 81, 83, 85, 88*, to prove that a Man may be a willful

willful, habitual Sinner; and yet perform this Duty aright, if he does but *seriously* remember Christ's Body broken and Blood shed, at the Time of his Eating and Drinking: I cannot but observe how directly contrary this is to the exprefs Doctrine of our Church. For after the Exhortation, the Priest is directed to say; *Ye that do truly and earnestly repent you of your Sins, and are in Love and Charity with your Neighbours, and intend to lead a new Life, following the Commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy Ways; draw near with Faith, and take this Holy Sacrament to your Comfort, &c.* Does it not appear from hence to be the exprefs Doctrine of our Church, that a Man cannot take this Holy Sacrament to his Comfort, and therefore cannot receive it *worthily*, except he do *truly and earnestly* repent of his Sins, and is in Love and Charity with his Neighbours, and intends to lead a new Life, following the Commandments of God, &c. And how will this consist with our Author's Doctrine? or rather how will our Author's Doctrine agree with that, with which it *ought* to agree, *i. e.* with the Doctrine of our Church?

After the *Trisagium* the Priest is directed to pray thus, *Grant us therefore Gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh of thy dear Son, and to drink his Blood, that our sinful Bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our Souls wash'd through his most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.* Does not every one at first Sight see, that the Priest prays to God, that we may eat and drink this Holy Communion, the Sacramental Body and Blood

of

of Christ, so that it may be to us his Body and Blood in Power and Effect, as conveying to us the Grace of the Divine Spirit, to enable us to cleanse ourselves from all Filthiness, both of the Flesh and Spirit? But our Author, being no Friend to *divine Grace*, as it signifies the Impressions and Influence of God's Spirit, tells us the plain Meaning of the Words is this; "Grant that we, tho' unworthy—may eat this Bread and drink this Wine, which are now to be taken in Remembrance of the Flesh and Blood and Christ, so worthily—that we may be acceptable to thee in it; and that our Religious Attendance upon this Rite, may prove one *Mean* of our answering the great End of our Blessed Lord's living and dying for our Benefit; *the being purified both in Soul and Body*, and may help to lead us to a State of Holiness, by which alone we can hope to be in Union and Friendship." In Opposition to this cold Paraphrase, and what he says, *Page 116*, to support it, I desire the Reader to observe, that the Priest does most expressly pray that our Bodies may be made clean by his (Christ's) Body, *i. e.* his Sacramental Body, which is the means of conveying to us the Power of the Spirit, to enable us to keep free from Sin.

"The Prayer called the Prayer of Consecration follows next, says our Author. And this is so framed, says he, that the whole Congregation is supposed to join in the *one only* Petition in it;" and to shew you that it is not the peculiar Office of the Priest to say this Prayer, he writes the Word *we* in large dif-

ferent Letters. So then it plainly appears, that according to his Notions there is either no Consecration of the Bread and Wine, or the People have as much Right and Power to consecrate them, as the Priest: And so *Tindal* and our Author are no Enemies. But the Reader will remember what we have already proved, that the Bread and Wine are to be consecrated, by being offered to God in Memory of Christ, with Prayer for a divine Blessing; and that by the Priest, not by the People; for it was to the *Apostles*, and in them to their *Successors* and *Substitutes*, that our Lord said, *Do, or Offer*, this for a Memorial of me. And according to our Lord's Institution, our Church requires the Priest, and confines it to him alone, to say this Memorial Prayer of Consecration. "When the Priest, "standing before the Table, *says the Rubric*, "hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that "he may with the more Readiness and De- "cency break the Bread before the People "(i. e. so that they may see the Action) and "take the Cup into his Hands, *he* (the Priest) "shall say, &c." *Almighty God, &c.—Hear us O Merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and grant that we receiving these THY Creatures of Bread and Wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's Holy Institution, in Remembrance of his Death and Passion, may be Partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood, &c.* In which Words the Priest dedicates, or offers, the Bread and Wine to God in Memory of Christ, praying that they may be to us the Body and Blood of Christ in Power and Effect, by means of the Presence and Blessing of the Life-

Life giving Spirit. But our Author says, that these Words do imply this Doctrine, *Pag. 117*, " that to eat *this* Bread and drink *this* Wine,—in a religious Remembrance of " Christ's Death, is truly and sufficiently to " answer the End of the Institution." What does he mean by *this* Bread, and *this* Wine? does he mean Bread and Wine first consecrated, by being offered to God in Memory of Christ, by a Commission'd Officer of Christ, with Prayer for a divine special Blessing? No! he holds nothing of all this; he means therefore, mere common Bread and Wine, differing nothing from other Bread and Wine, but only in that they are eaten and drunk with a serious Remembrance of Christ. And he tells us himself, that this is his Meaning, *Page 121*. " It is *he alone*, says he, (that is " the Lay-Communicant) who must by his " own inward Thought, and Application of " his Mind to the Remembrance of Christ, " make this Bread and this Wine different to " himself, from Bread and Wine taken at a " common Meal:" So that according to our Author's Notion, this Bread and this Cup is not beneficial to the worthy Communicant by any Blessing of the Divine Spirit, but it is *He alone*, that is, the worthy Communicant *alone*, that makes this Bread and this Cup to differ from a Common Meal, by *his own* inward Thought and Application to the Remembrance of Christ. And accordingly he sinks down the above Words of the Priest, (which the People, according to him, have as much Right to use as the Priest) thus low, *Page 117*, viz. *That we may, by the sincere Performance of*
L 2
this

this Part of our Christian Duty, (i. e. by eating Bread and Wine with a serious Remembrance of Christ) be led (not by the Impressions of divine Grace convey'd in and by this Ordinance, for that he denies p. 156.) to the Practice of that Universal Righteousness to which Christianity obliges us; and by these Means be prepared and qualified to partake of all the Benefits of Christ's Body broken, and Blood shed. But let the Reader observe the plain, natural Sense of these Words, which the Priest speaks to God, when he is making the Memorial, which Christ commanded to be made: Grant that we receiving these thy Creatures of Bread and Wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy Institution, in Remembrance of his Death and Passion (he says, these THY Creatures dedicating and offering them to God in Memory of Christ, according to Christ's own Institution) may be Partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood, he prays that the Bread and Wine offered by him to God in Memory of Christ, may become to us the Body and Blood of Christ in Power and Effect, by the Presence and Blessing of the Divine Spirit. He declares them to be God's Creatures in a more especial Manner, then given or offered to him, and prays for a divine special Blessing upon them. And this is so peculiar a Part of the Priest's Office, that whatever Layman shall presume to say this Prayer, he prophanes God's Ordinance and invades the Priesthood: The People indeed are justly required to say an hearty Amen; by which they express their hearty Desire and humble Request to God, that the Ministration of his Priest, and the
 Memorial

Memorial by him made, may be acceptable to the effectual Pleading of the Covenant. But if they exceed their proper Office, and pretend to repeat the Prayer of Consecration, they must be told, *that no Man taketh this Honour* (of offering Gifts and Sacrifices for Men) *unto himself*, but he that is *called of God as was Aaron*: And if any one shall presume to do otherwise, the Instances of King Saul, 1 Sam. xiii. and of King Uzziab, 2 Chron. xxvi. may give him to understand, that instead of a Blessing, he will pull down a Curse upon himself.

Our Author goes on to explain away the Life and Soul of those *propitiatory* Words, made use of by the Priest, at the Delivery of the Bread and the Cup to every Communicant. *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul unto everlasting Life.* The Meaning of which, our Author says (p. 119.) is this, “ That the
 “ *real Body* of Christ, long ago offered up
 “ upon the Cross; or that the Sufferings of
 “ Christ may effectually answer that good
 “ Purpose, *for which they are design’d*; and
 “ move and influence you so in the Virtuous
 “ Conduct of your whole Lives in this World,
 “ that you may obtain his Promise of ever-
 “ lasting Life in the World to come.” But I desire the Reader to observe, whether the plain natural Construction of the Words do not run thus; *the Body of our Lord Jesus, which was given* (just now representatively given, or offered, to God) *for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul unto Everlasting Life.* He takes the *Representative Body* of Christ into his Hand,
 and

and holds it *to and before* God, and prays that it may *preserve* the Communicant's *Body and Soul unto everlasting Life*, by conveying to him the Grace and Power of the Spirit, to enable him to observe the Terms of the Covenant, and so to obtain everlasting Life. The same, *mutatis mutandis*, may be said of the Cup, the *Representative Blood* of Christ.

In the first Prayer, after the Lord's Prayer, in the Post-Communion are these Words; "most humbly beseeching thee to grant, "that by the Merits and Death of thy Son "Jesus Christ, and through Faith in his "Blood, we and all thy whole Church may "obtain Remission of our Sins, and all o- "ther Benefits of his Passion——humbly "beseeching thee, that all we who are Par- "takers of this Holy Communion may be "fulfilled with thy Grace and Heavenly Be- "nediction." These Things, says our Au- thor, *Page 127*, "are not spoken of, as seal- "ed to us, or procured for us, by this single "Action of partaking worthily of the Lord's "Supper." But the Reader will observe, that the Church directs the Priest to pray, *that by the Merits and Death of Christ* (which he had just represented to God in the appointed Me- morials thereof) *we and all his whole Church may obtain*, &c. and that he is furthermore di- rected to pray, *that all we who are Partakers of this Holy Communion, may be fulfilled with God's Grace and Heavenly Benediction*: He plain- ly and expressly prays, that the Holy Com- munion, the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ, then received, may become spiritual Strength to us, by Means of the Grace of the

life-

life-giving Spirit, conveyed to us, in and by this Holy Communion, this sacramental Body and Blood of Christ.

Our Author goes on, agreeable to his own Hypothesis, to take a great deal of Pains Pages 129, 130, 131, to explain away the Life and Sense of the Prayer next following. I shall not be tedious to the Reader in transcribing what he says, but shall only desire that it may be considered, whether the plain natural Construction of the Prayer, do not run thus; *viz. Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these Holy Mysteries (the Holy Symbols of consecrated Bread and Wine) with the spiritual Food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ (with that which is his Body and Blood in Power and Effect, by the Presence and Blessing of the life-giving Spirit) and dost assure us thereby (i. e. by this sacramental Body and Blood of thy Son) of thy Favour and Goodness towards us; and that we are very Members incorporate in the mystical Body of thy Son, which is the blessed Company of all faithful People; and are also Heirs through Hope, of thy everlasting Kingdom, by the Merits of the Death and Passion of thy dear Son. And we most humbly beseech thee, O Heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy Grace, that we may continue in that Holy Fellowship (into which thou dost assure us by this Sacrament, that we are put) and do all such good Works, as thou hast prepared for us to walk in, through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom &c.*

Our Author goes on, Page 133, &c. to consider whether any, or what Benefits are annexed

nexed to this Ordinance: And has handled the plain Doctrine of our Church, in the *Church-Catechism*, as roughly as he has handled the *Communion-Office*.

Some good *Interpreters*, he acknowledges, have expounded, as relating to the Lord's Supper, this Passage 1 Cor. xii. 13, *For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.* He takes a great deal of Pains, and labours hard to little Purpose for 8 or 9 Pages, to prove, that the drinking into one Spirit, mentioned in the Text, signifies partaking of the extraordinary Gifts of working Miracles, healing Diseases, &c. But there is one thing in the very Text itself, which I think quite overthrows this Interpretation. When the Apostle says, *we have been all made to drink into one Spirit*, he plainly means, all Christians. By *one Spirit*, says he, *are we all baptiz'd into one Body, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.* The same All that are baptiz'd, the very same All are said to drink into one Spirit. Now it is certain, that All Christians did not partake of the *Extraordinary Gifts*, nor were All Christians intituled to them; but all Christians either did, or at least, as Christians, were intituled to partake of the Lord's Supper. And the Reader will observe, that if this Text does relate to the Lord's Supper, it plainly speaks of it, as that, whereby the Power or Grace of the Spirit is communicated to us. But whether this particular Text relates to the Lord's Supper or not; that the *sacramental Body and Blood* of Christ convey to all worthy

worthy Receivers the Grace of the divine Spirit, is plain from our Lord's own Words, *John vi. 53, 54, 63.*

He denies that Pardon of Sin, is derived to the worthy Communicant (Page 144.) in this Sacrament, or that it is the Conveyance of divine Grace, *Page 154, 156,* and elsewhere. And indeed I should be of the same Mind, if I had the same low Notion of this Institution as he has, " That the whole of it " is no more than a bare eating some Bread " and drinking some Wine, with a serious " Remembrance of Christ, without any previous Consecration of them into the spiritual Body and Blood of Christ, by an Oblation of them to God as the Representatives of his Body and Blood, and an Invocation for the Presence and Blessing of the life-giving Spirit by a commission'd Officer of Jesus Christ." But I have proved that the Lord's Supper is a propitiatory Oblation, made by Christ's own Appointment to God, to move him to be gracious and favourable to us, in the Pardon of our Sins, and in confirming to us the other Benefits of Christ's Passion; and consequently it is to all worthy Receivers the Seal of Pardon, and the Conveyance of divine Grace.

To call this Sacrament the *Food* of our Souls, he tells us *Page 161,* " is a mistaken Expression, from which there is great Danger; " because the *Rite* itself consisting in eating " Bread and drinking Wine, the Expression " is apt to convey the Notion of something, " *mechanically, or miraculously* convey'd at the " same time into the *Soul*, which is Food to

M

that,

“ *that, as the Bread eaten is to the Body.*” But let us hear him who is the Way and the Truth, our blessed Lord the Founder of this holy Institution, speaking thus, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that feedeth on my Flesh and maketh my Blood his Drink, hath eternal Life,* hath that within him, *viz.* the Power of the Spirit, which will fit and prepare him for eternal Life: and again, *It is the Spirit that giveth Life,* assuring us that the Power of the Spirit is convey’d in and by his sacramental Body and Blood, to all worthy Communicants.

It is another very great Mistake in our Author’s Account, Page 164, to call this Sacrament the *Renewal* of the New Covenant, on our Part; and the *Seal* of it on God’s Part. Upon this he spends 10 or 12 Pages; and never was greater Waste of Paper than here; where he has not one Argument to the Purpose. He either willfully or ignorantly supposes, that by celebrating the Lord’s Supper, we cannot be said to renew our Covenant, because, (as he will have it) the Covenant cannot be *renew’d* unless it has been first *totally forfeited*. If this Argument proves any thing, it proves too much; for if God’s *covenanted Favour* be once *totally forfeited*, (which, if it means any thing, must mean, if we are so fallen as to have no *Title*, no *Claim* left on any *Score* to God’s *covenanted Favour*) then I do insist upon it, that there is no Way left to *renew* the Covenant; for if we may have the *Privilege* or *Favour* to *renew* the Covenant, in any Way or Manner, then it is plain we have not *totally forfeited* God’s *covenanted Favour*: But in the present Argument it is supposed

pos
ture
Cov
Wh
the
a fo
it, I
such
men
if I
ther
total
quer
In
his
“ of
“ it
befo
ter i
unse
of P
ding
Que
“ of
“ it
“ co
“ is
mean
vena
and
ment
Does
pafs
Cbris
the
and

posed, that there must be first a *total* Forfeiture of God's *covenanted* Favour, before the Covenant can be renewed; which is absurd. Wherefore before he argues against *renewing the Covenant*, from the supposed Necessity of a foregoing *total Forfeiture of all the Benefits of it*, he should have told us what will amount to such a *total Forfeiture*; otherwise his Argument concludes nothing to the Purpose. Tho' if I take him right he seems to argue, that there can be no such Thing (in this Life) as a *total Forfeiture* of the Covenant, and consequently no such thing as a *Renewal* of it.

In the next Paragraph Page 166, He alters his Phrase, and talks "of a *Re-establishment* of the *Christian Covenant* on our Part, after "it has been *shaken* by our Sins:" Whereas before he had been talking of *renewing* it after it had been *totally forfeited*: Thus by the unsettled Use of Words, and the Alterations of Phrases he amuses the Reader by confounding and perplexing the true State of the Question. But says he, "the *Re-establishment* of the *Christian Covenant* on our part, if "it has been *shaken* by our Sins, can be only "compassed by that *actual* Amendment, which "is Part of the Covenant." I suppose he means, that according to the Terms of the Covenant, we cannot hope for God's full Favour and Acceptance without the actual Amendment of our Lives. Well and what then? Does it therefore follow that *Assurances* cannot pass between *God*, and the humble penitent *Christian*; that the one will go on to observe the Terms of the Covenant for the future, and that the other, if that be done, will not fail

fail to make him Partaker of the full Benefits of the Covenant? To shew the Vanity of our Author's Reasoning, I need only put the Case: Suppose you and I should enter into a Covenant; cannot we from time to time renew or keep up this Covenant, by giving one another repeated Assurances, that we will each of us stand to our Part of the Covenant? Or even supposing that I have not exactly answered my Part of the Covenant; yet upon my hearty Acknowledgments and Profession of greater Care for the future, cannot you give me a repeated Assurance, that if I do so for the future, you will stand to your Part of the Covenant? I will not say that this does *exactly* answer the Case in Dispute; But I apprehend, it will sufficiently shew the Vanity of our Author's Reasoning. But says our Author, "we may acknowledge our Obligation to keep the Covenant, by a *verbal* Profession of our Faith" (Page 164). Well, and so we may; but where is the *visible, outward Pledge and Assurance*, on God's Part? This is to be had only in the *Sacrament of the Altar*.

Our Author goes on, Page 167, to argue as weakly, "that the Lord's Supper cannot be the *Seal* of the Christian Covenant on God's Part: Because (as he asserts) the *real Blood* of Christ, as shed for us, or in other Words, his Death, is the only *Seal* of the Covenant." As if because the Gospel Covenant was confirmed by the Death of Christ, therefore God cannot give us a repeated, visible Assurance that he will stand to it! Who sees not the Weakness and the Vanity of such Sort of Reasoning? If I was dispos'd

dispos'd to cavil, I should shew his Reasoning in the following Part of the Paragraph, to be very *Illogical*, in that he uses the same Word in the *same* Argument in two different Senses. He uses Christ's *Death*, and Christ's *Blood*, as synonymous Terms: And yet in the former Part of his Argument he uses the Term *Christ's Blood* or *Christ's Death*, for the *shedding* of his Blood, or for his *undergoing* Death; and then in his Conclusion he uses *Christ's Blood*, not for the *shedding* of it, but for his *very Blood shed*. This every one knows to be contrary to the true Rules of Argument; and consequently such a sort of Argument proves nothing.

And here I cannot pass by a notable Discovery he has made *Page 171*. He tells us, "That Christ's real Blood answers to the Blood of the Sacrifices under the Law." But he had told us *Page 168*, "That Christ's Blood was the Seal of the Gospel-Covenant because his Death was a Proof, that the Terms brought by him to Mankind from God, were truly what he had represented them to be." What will he say, *That the Blood of the Sacrifices under the Law, was the Seal of the Law-Covenant, as being a Proof that the Terms brought by Moses, were truly what he had represented them to be?* And yet this he must say, if he will maintain, that the *Blood* of Christ, as a Proof of his Doctrine, answers to the Blood of the Sacrifices under the Law. In Opposition to this, I desire the Reader to observe, that the Law-Sacrifices, as they were offered by the Priests, literally were Pleadings of the Covenant, made with *Abraham* and
with

with *Moses*, in behalf of the whole *Jewish* Nation, and Acknowledgments of God's Justice and Mercy in respect of temporal Life, and the Blessings of the Land of *Canaan*: But as they were mystical, they were all Representations of Christ's Priesthood; Claims and Pleadings of the Mercy promis'd in the Covenant of Grace, founded on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Jesus Christ. This, as far as I can learn, has been the Judgment of all sound Divines. Hence the *Blood of the Sacrifices* was called the *Blood of the Covenant*, as being literally the Pleading of the Temporal Covenant, mystically the Pleading of the Covenant of Grace, procured by the *Blood*, and founded on the *Sacrifice* and *Priesthood* of Christ. But that I may not tire my Reader by running thro' every weak Argument our Author uses, I desire it may be remembred, that I have proved the Lord's Supper to be a Feast upon a Sacrifice of Bread and Wine, offered to God, as Representatives of Christ's Body and Blood. Now Sacrifices were always accounted *covenanting* Rites, with that God to whom they are offered; and this in the Scripture Account, as the Reader may be satisfied, only by consulting *Psalms* l. 5. *Leviticus* ii. 13. And therefore, since the Lord's Supper is a Feast on a Sacrifice offered to the true God, it is the Way and means of *covenanting* and holding Communion with him: to which the Apostle bears Witness, *1 Cor.* x. 16, 22. where his Parallel requires, that as *by drinking the Cup of Devils, we hold Fellowship, or Communion, with Devils, so by drinking the Cup of the Lord, we hold Fellowship, or Communion, with the true God.*
And

And if the Reader will call to mind, that Christ himself was the Founder of this Representative Sacrifice in the Lord's Supper, he will presently see, that it is the *appointed* Way of covenanting with God; I mean of renewing and keeping up from time to time that Covenant, into which we first entered *at* and *by* our Baptism. And hence the Reader may perceive how *weakly*, how *directly against himself*, our Author argues, *Page 171*, "That the Lord's Supper cannot be a *covenanting Rite*, because it succeeds in the Place of the Passover:" whereas the *Passover* was a Feast upon a *Sacrifice*, and consequently (as I have shewn) a *covenanting Rite*. The Lord's Supper therefore (notwithstanding all our Author has said to the contrary) is a *covenanting Rite*, in which we bind ourselves to keep the Terms of the Christian Covenant, and God gives us visible Assurances in the Pledges of his Son's Body and Blood, that he will make us Partakers of the Benefits of the Covenant: It is the Means of holding Communion with God, in that *we give to him* the appointed Representations of his Son's Body and Blood, and *he returns them to us*, for a spiritual Banquet, full of Life and Spirit: The true Notion of Communion consisting in *giving and receiving*: And the serious Reader is desired to consider, whether upon a fair and impartial Examination, there can be any *Communion* with God, in the Old and New Testament Notion of Communion with him, without the partaking of a material Sacrifice offered to him. The *Jews* had their Communion with God, by partaking of the Sacrifices offered to him: And
Christians

Christians have their Communion with him by partaking of the Representative Sacrifice offered to him, of his Son's Body and Blood. See 1 Cor. x. 16—22.

And now if you would know, what Benefit attends the Performance of this Duty; why he will tell you; “ That it is indeed your
 “ Duty, to eat some Bread and drink some
 “ Wine, in any Manner whatever that is usually practised at a common Meal (nay he
 “ tells you Page 53, it would do as well upon the *Floor*, if it was the Custom to eat
 “ upon the Ground) with a serious Remembrance of Christ, and when you have done
 “ this, you may be sure you have done a Duty; and that is all; as for any immediate Consequent Benefit, it is deluding ourselves,
 “ *Page 116.*” a fond and groundless Imagination Page 157, a mere *Dream* Page 181, and what not? O *Sancte Jesu!* what Ears can bear this, without being shocked?

And now Reader, make no Wonder at his following low, jejune, Interpretations of our Church Catechism, most plainly repugnant to the plain Natural Sense. Our Church holds two Sacraments as generally necessary to Salvation: And defines a Sacrament to be,
 “ an outward and visible Sign of an inward
 “ and spiritual Grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby
 “ we receive the same (*inward and spiritual Grace*) and a Pledge to assure us thereof.” Now says our Author, *Page 191*, “ In partaking of the Lord's Supper, we may be said
 “ to receive a Sacrament in the present Sense
 “ of that Word, as we receive Bread and
 “ Wine,

“ Wine, which are outward and visible Signs
 “ of those inward and spiritual Mercies” (tho’
 by the Way, it will be an hard Matter to
 know what he means by his *inward and spi-*
ritual Mercies) “ which are given to us by our
 “ Lord, upon the Terms of his Religion;
 “ and these Signs ordained to this Purpose of
 “ Remembrance, by Christ himself; and
 “ upon this Account to be considered as
 “ Means (amongst others) tending to that
 “ Christian Behaviour, &c.” As Means ten-
 ding to that Christian Behaviour, which will
 at last entitle us to those Mercies; how, by
 conveying any *inward and spiritual Grace* to us?
 no, he elsewhere even laughs at the Notion of *su-*
pernatural Favours, to be convey’d in and by
 the outward Signs, Page 181, and tells us
 Page 156, It is no good Sense of the Phrase,
Means of Grace, to call the Lord’s Supper a
Means of Grace, as conveying any inward su-
 pernatural Benefit, or Impressions. But our
 Church, on the contrary, asserts that *the out-*
ward Sign in the Sacrament, is ordained to be
 the Means of conveying the *same* inward and
 spiritual Grace, which is signified by the out-
 ward Sign.

The Answer to this Question, *Why was the*
Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper ordained? is, in
 our Church Catechism, viz. *For the continual*
Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of
Christ, and of the Benefits which we receive
thereby. We see, says he Page 147, “It is for the
 “ Remembrance of all the Benefits which are
 “ promised to be bestowed upon us by means of
 “ Christ; and not for the *actual Receiving* those
 “ Benefits, that our Church declares this Rite

“to be ordained.” And yet our Church expressly teaches, that in the Lord’s Supper, our Souls are strengthened and refreshed by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our Bodies are by the Bread and Wine. When our Church says, “The Lord’s Supper was ordained for “the continual Remembrance, &c.” It is plain, this refers to our Saviour’s own Words, *Do this in Remembrance of*, for a Memorial, of *me*: The plain Meaning therefore of that Answer is, “For the making a continual Memorial before God of the grand Sacrifice of “Christ, and thereby for the continual pleading the Benefits of the Covenant *purchased* “thereby:” Or in other Words, “For the “bringing of the Grand Sacrifice of Christ’s “Body and Blood, and the Covenant of “Grace, the Sum of the Benefits purchased “for us thereby, into continual Remembrance before God, that he may see and “behold the *one* (the Sacrifice of Christ) in “the appointed Representations thereof, and “so remember the *other* (the Covenant of “Grace) for our Good.” Our Church doth herein plainly teach us, that the Lord’s Supper was ordained, To bring the Sacrifice of Christ’s Death, and the Covenant of Grace purchas’d thereby, into continual Remembrance before God, and that by unavoidable Consequence, for the applying and confirming the Benefits thereof to us.

Our Author therefore doth our Church much Wrong, as in this, so in what follows. The Answer to this Question, *What is the inward part, or thing signify’d in the Lord’s Supper?* is, *The Body and Blood of Christ, which*
are

are verily and indeed taken, and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper. " These, says " he, *may be said* to be received by the Faithful *i. e.* Believers, as they alone sincerely " and seriously eat this Bread, and drink this " Wine, in Memory of Christ's Body and " Blood," Page 148. For my part I have considered these Words over and over again, and for the Heart of me, I cannot conceive any manner of Sense, in which the Body and Blood of Christ *may be said* to be received by those, who receive only mere Bread and Wine: And our Author over and over again makes the sacramental Bread and Wine, to be no more than mere Bread and Wine, only eaten and drunk with a serious Remembrance of Christ. Nay, he himself cannot make it out: " The " Body and Blood of Christ *may be said* to be " received," says he: But our Church says, that they *are* verily and indeed received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper, not *substantially*, (for our Church has elsewhere over and over again, declared her Abhorrence of a *Transubstantiation*) but in *Power* and *Effect*. The Bread and Wine are the Representations of Christ's Body and Blood; yea and they are (as I have already proved) his Body and Blood in *Power* and *Effect*: The Faithful therefore *i. e.* all worthy Receivers, do verily and indeed receive that, which is his Body and Blood in Power and Effect, by Means of the life-giving Spirit, and consequently they do partake in the Benefits purchased by the grand Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood, *i. e.* Pardon and Grace, and have their Covenant Title to Happiness farther confirm'd to them.

Hence our Church rightly teaches us, in Answer to this Question, *What are the Benefits of which we are Partakers thereby?* that they are *The Strengthening and Refreshing of our Souls, by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our Bodies are by the Bread and Wine.* That is, says our Author pag. 162, “ As Bread and Wine, considered only as *natural Food*, strengthen and refresh our Bodies; so this Bread and Wine, considered and taken as Memorials of the Body and Blood of Christ our Master, lead us by their peculiar Tendency, to all such Thoughts and Practices, as are indeed the Improvement and Health of our Souls.” Observe, “ The Bread and Wine received with a serious Remembrance of Christ, lead us by their (*own*) peculiar Tendency;” for he denies any Grace, or divine Influence and supernatural Assistance to be convey’d to us, in or by this Ordinance. A serious Remembrance of Christ in our Minds, may indeed with Justice be said, to have a Tendency to lead us to such Thoughts and Practices, as are the Improvement and Health of our Souls: But that the mere Bread and Wine can have any such Tendency, *peculiar Tendency*, in the Nature of the Thing, (and our Author never goes any farther than the *natural Tendency* of a Thing in itself) cannot be imagin’d. But let that be as it will: Our Author asserts, that *our Souls are said to be strengthened and refreshed in the Lord’s Supper*; for this Reason, *viz.* “ Because the Bread and Wine, eaten and drunk in a serious Remembrance of Christ, do by their own peculiar Tendency lead us to such Thoughts and Practices,

“ Practices, as are indeed the Improvement
 “ and Health of our Souls.” A very insuffi-
 cient Reason truly! Whereas our Church
 plainly teacheth, “ That as the Bread and
 “ the Wine, consider’d as such, do strength-
 “ en and refresh our Bodies; so consider’d
 “ and received, as what they really are, *viz.*
 “ the Body and Blood of Christ in Power and
 “ Effect, they do strengthen and refresh our
 “ Souls, by Means of the Power and Grace
 “ of the Divine Spirit, convey’d to us there-
 “ by:” Agreeable to what our Lord has
 said, *It is the Spirit that giveth Life*; assuring us
 that the Power of the life-giving Spirit, God
 the Holy Ghost, is convey’d in and by his
 sacramental Body and Blood. Thus Reader,
 you see how much our Author has misrep-
 resented the Doctrine of our Church, which it
 is said, whether truly I know not, that he is
 in a more especial Manner bound, not only to
 maintain himself, but to see it maintained by
 others.

But before I leave this Head, I must take
 Notice of one more remarkable Declaration,
 made by our Author: He asserts *pages* 160,
 174, “ That Prayer is *absolutely* distinct from
 “ the Participation of the Lord’s Supper,
 “ and that the Communion would be as com-
 “ pleat without it, as with it.” From hence
 I gather the Full of our Author’s Notion con-
 cerning the Lord’s Supper; *viz.* that as there
 is no Oblation or Consecration, no need of
 Priest or Prayer, either Verbal or Mental;
 (for so his Words plainly seem to imply) so if
 three or four Persons lying on the Ground,
 (if it was the Custom to eat our Victuals upon
 the

the Ground) should eat some Bread and drink some Wine, provided they do but think seriously of Christ, *while* they are eating and drinking, they would perform the *whole* of the Duty, and that worthily too. A poor, low, degrading Notion indeed! But I have already proved, that Christ offered Bread and Wine to God with a Prayer for a divine special Blessing upon them; and commanded and commissioned his Apostles, and in them their Successors and Substitutes, the Bishops and Priests of the Christian Church, to do the same for a Memorial of him. I deny not but the solemn Oblation of the Bread and Wine by the Priest, as the appointed Representations of Christ's Body and Blood, is more powerful or available with God, than any *verbal Petitions* for Pardon and Acceptance, as being the instituted Claim and Pleading of the Covenant of Grace: But then it is to be noted, that, by our Lord's Institution, the Priest is not only to offer the appointed Representations of his Body and Blood to God, for Pardon and Acceptance, but also to *blefs* them, in the Sense of procuring a divine special Blessing upon them, that they may be to us the Body and Blood of Christ in Power and Effect, and so the Conveyance of divine Grace: And therefore this divine Service of the Sacrament of the Altar, cannot be perform'd, as not without a *Priest*, so not without the Prayer of the Priest.

And whereas our Author is pleas'd to tell his Reader, in his Appendix *page* 186, "that
" this Institution is called the Communion,
" or the Holy Communion, because it is a

" Joint-

“ Joint-partaking of Bread and Wine in Re-
 “ membrance of Christ, by which we declare
 “ ourselves, with all other Christians, to be
 “ one Body:” from what has been said, the
 Reader will perceive the *true* Reason, why
 this Institution is called by that Name, *viz.*
 “ Because we *give* or offer to God the appoin-
 “ ted Representations of his Sons Body and
 “ Blood, and have them returned to us for a
 “ spiritual Banquet, full of Life and Spirit:”
 The true and full Notion of Communion being
 that of *giving* and *receiving*.

And now Reader, judge I pray you upon
 the whole, whether our Author has any Rea-
 son to ridicule the Doctrine of a representa-
 tive Sacrifice in the Eucharist; which is pro-
 ved to be the Doctrine of Christ, his Apostles,
 the primitive Writers, and the whole Catholic
 Church for 1500 Years, which is the Doctrine
 of our Church to this Day, and which was ne-
 ver gainsaid till the Time of *John Calvin*, that
Scandal to the Reformation; whether, I say,
 he has any Reason to ridicule this Doctrine as
 he does, under the Notion of a *Stage-Play*:
 Whether his Notion of the Lord's Supper be
 not wrong, and highly reflecting on the Chris-
 tian Scheme, *viz.* that the whole of it is no
 more than *bare eating and drinking mere un-*
sanctify'd Bread and Wine, (there being accor-
 ding to him, no Necessity for Priest or Prayer)
in Remembrance of Christ, as of a Person corpo-
rally absent from his Disciples. And whether, on
 the other hand, our Notion of it be not agree-
 able to the plain, natural Sense of what we
 read about it in the New Testament, as it cer-
 tainly is to what the primitive Writers say of
 it,

it, viz. That it is a Memorial and Representation made to God of the Sacrifice which Christ once offered; wherein we set before God Bread and Wine, as Figures or Images of the precious Blood of Christ shed for us, and of his precious Body, to put God, by these memorial Oblations, in mind of him, and to beseech God thereby to be merciful to his Church and People, and to be mindful of the Covenant of Grace, establish'd on the Priesthood and Sacrifice of Jesus Christ. According to us, and we go according to Scripture and Antiquity, it is the instituted Claim and pleading of the Covenant of Grace, and by Consequence, the Seal of Pardon and the Conveyance of divine Grace: But according to him who stands upon his own Legs all along, it is an empty, barren Rite, no pleading of the Covenant, no Seal of Pardon, no Conveyance of Divine Grace; to which (divine Grace) he appears to be so great a Stranger, that he either knows not what the Church of Christ means by it, or else he absolutely denies it. And this brings me in the Fourth Place, to point out some Passages in his Book, which in their plain Construction, contradict the received Faith and Doctrine of Christ's Church, in other Points, as well as in that of the Christian Sacrifice.

In the first Place then: The Catholic Church maintains the Doctrine of Original Sin, and the Necessity of divine Grace, by which she understands a supernatural Influence and Assistance of the Holy Ghost, to move the Affections, and incline to Good, the perverse Will of the fallen Sons of Adam, the Corruption of whose Nature since the Fall is such, that we can
neither

neither will good nor do good, without the Grace of God by Christ, preventing us that we may have a good Will, and working with us when we have a good Will. This, as it has been the constant Doctrine of the Catholic Church in general, so it is the professed Doctrine of our Church in particular; (see Articles ix, x.) and whoever denies this is an arrant *Pelagian*. Now our Author has a great deal in his Book, that looks very earnestly this way. Thus page 154. "The Benefits received from all such Performances, by reasonable Creatures, cannot possibly be received, but in a reasonable way;" (i. e. in a natural Way, in Opposition to all supernatural Influences; for so the very next Words make appear.) "These Duties, how well soever performed, cannot be supposed to operate as Charms, nor to influence us, as if we were only Clock-work, or Machines, to be acted upon by the arbitrary Force of a superior Being." Words how reflecting upon the inward Influence and working of the Holy Ghost! and how shocking to a Christian Ear! Again, page 156, "What reasonable Creature would not be content with Benefits of this Sort (i. e. such as proceed from a Thing's own natural Tendency) without fancying to himself Privileges, Communications, or Impressions from above." So then, it seems supernatural Impressions are but mere Fancies. And presently after, in the same Page; "In this way (i. e. in its own natural Tendency, not by any divine Influence, or supernatural Impressions) the Lord's Supper is one of the Means of Grace, in every good Sense

“ Sense of that Phrase.” So then to call any
 thing a *Means of Grace*, in the Sense of a di-
 vine supernatural Influence and Assistance, is,
 in our Author’s Opinion, no good Sense of
 that Phrase. And therefore in the very next
 Words, he tells us, “ The Lord’s Supper, a-
 mongst *other Means*, helps to render us fit
 for all such *Assistances*, as are proper for
 God to give to free and reasonable Creatures.”
 Therefore it is plain, that in our Author’s O-
 pinion, *supernatural Influences* and *Impressions*,
 are not *Assistances*, proper for God to give to
 free and reasonable Creatures. Hence it is,
 that he puts these Words into his Communi-
 cant’s Mouth, page 125. “ Direct and assist
 me in all my Endeavours, by all such Me-
 thods, as are proper (note the Expression,
 as are proper) to move and assist thy free
 and reasonable Creatures.” What St Paul
 calls the *Fruit of the Spirit*, i. e. the Graces
 and Virtues wrought in us, by the Concur-
 rence and Co-operation of the third Person of
 the blessed Trinity, our Author interprets
 page 138, of the *Christian Spirit*, the genuine
Work and Product of Christianity; which he calls
 the good Spirit of the Gospel, page 111, plainly
 meaning, by the *Fruit of the Spirit*, no more
 than the Christian Temper and Disposition of
 Mind, which is taught and required by the
 Doctrines of Christianity. And page 181, he
 represents the Notion of *supernatural Favours*
 as a mere *Dream*. In the Beginning of his
 third Prayer, page 208, he has these Words,
 “ I earnestly beseech thee to forgive every
 Thought, every Word, and every Action,
 by which I have in the least Degree offen-
 ded

" ded thee, or transgressed the Rules of Vir-
 " tue and true Religion, from the Beginning
 " of my *rational* Life, to this Hour." And
 again page 214, " As his (Christ's) Disciple,
 " I intreat of thee the Pardon of whatsoever
 " thou hast seen amiss in me, from the Be-
 " ginning of my *rational* Life, unto this Day."
 It is true, he has these Words page 212,
 " Guide and govern me by thy *Holy Spirit*,
 " in my sincere Endeavours:" and page 243,
 " Guide me by the Dispositions of thy *Provi-*
 " *dence and good Spirit*:" And page 248,
 " We beseech thee to concur with us by thy
 " Providence and good Spirit," &c. But can
 any reasonable Man believe, that in those
 Words he designs to pray for the supernatural
 Assistance and divine Impressions of the eter-
 nal Spirit, God the Holy Ghost, when he has
 so plainly denied, yea and ridiculed the No-
 tion of *supernatural Assistance and Impressions*
 from above? ... But to proceed, in the second
 Place, the Catholic Church holds, that Bap-
 tism is the appointed Way and Means of en-
 tering into the Christian Covenant, and that
 Infants not only may, but ought to be baptiz-
 ed. This also is the express Doctrine of our
 Church; see Article xxvii. But our Author
 has one notable Passage that looks a quite con-
 trary way, page 170, " The Covenant is ac-
 " cepted and entered into by every Man,
 " personally on his own Part, at the Instant
 " of his first sincerely believing in Christ, and
 " professing himself his Disciple. *Before this*
 " *no Rite can personally engage him in this*
 " *Covenant*; because no one can be *personally*
 " engaged in a Religion, which he has not
 " personally

“ *personally* agreed to.” In which Words, if he means any thing, he plainly means, either that Baptism does not enter us into the Christian Covenant, or, that Infants are not to be baptized: Both which are repugnant to the received Doctrine of Christ’s Church. And tho’ the Catholic Church believes *one Baptism for the Remission of Sins* (see the *Nicene Creed*); yet page 150, he seems not to allow “any *Benefit*, “or *Privilege*, actually obtained at the Time of “receiving Baptism worthily, or by means of “it.” He does indeed allow Baptism to be a positive Duty, in the same Sense as the Lord’s Supper; but he plainly seems not to allow any *immediate* Benefit, or Privilege, consequent upon, or by means of Baptism, any more than he allows any *immediate* Benefit, or Privilege, consequent upon, or by means of the Lord’s Supper.

In the third Place, the Catholic Church maintains, that the Death of Christ was an Atonement for Sin, a Satisfaction made for the Dishonour done to God’s Law, and to his Attributes by Sin; that by his Death he *purchased* and procured for fallen Man, the favourable Allowances of the Covenant of Grace; and that we cannot be pardoned and accepted, and at last saved, but only for the Sake, and by the Merits of Jesus Christ. This is also the express Doctrine of our Church (see Articles ii, xi.); and whoever denies this, is a rank *Socinian*. But there are many Passages in our Author’s Book, that look directly this Way. Thus, pages 20, 21, in his Comment upon these Words of our Saviour, *This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for* the

the Remission of Sins, he makes him speak thus, " I call the Wine my Blood of the New Covenant, as it is to be drunk by you hereafter, in Remembrance of my Blood, shed by me in Testimony to the Truth of all that I have declared, as the Will or Covenant of God; ——— I style this Cup, or this Wine, the new Covenant in my Blood; because you are hereafter, thus to drink Wine in a Religious Remembrance of my Blood, in, or thro' which, after it shall be shed, this new Covenant will be confirmed, as by a Seal or Testimony to the Truth of it; in order to assure you the more undoubtedly of the Remission of your Sins, stipulated in that Covenant, upon true Repentance and Amendment." Again, page 120, " I drink this Wine in a serious Remembrance of Christ's Blood; which was shed for me and for many, for the Remission of Sins; that Blood which be freely shed, as a Seal to the new Covenant, in which he promises in the Name of God, Forgiveness and Favour upon our actual Amendment." Observe Reader, in both these Passages he makes Christ's Death not an *Atonement*, or *Satisfaction* for Sin, (which is the Catholic Doctrine) but only a *Seal* or *Testimony* to the Truth of his Doctrine: He makes Christ to die, not to *purchase Forgiveness*, but only to assure us, that our Sins shall be forgiven upon our actual Amendment: He does not make the Death of Christ, to be a *Sacrifice* for Sin, or to be the *Purchase* and *Procurement* of the new Covenant, but only that by his Death, as by a Seal or Testimony, he gave Proof, that he had declared Truth, and that the Terms brought by him to Man-

kind

kind from God, were truly what he had represented them to be; as himself speaks page 168. Wherefore Reader do not wonder at the following Passages. Page 147, "The Lord's Supper was ordained for the Remembrance of all the Benefits, which are *promised to be bestow'd upon us by means of Christ:*" Not which were purchased for us by the Sacrifice of Christ's Death. Again, page 171, "The Lord's Supper was instituted for the Remembrance of that Redemption, or Deliverance of Christians, *which God proposed (observe Reader) to them, by Christ, in his new Covenant:*" Not, *which Christ purchased and procured for them; but which God proposed to them by Christ, in the new Covenant.* If this be his Notion of Christ's Death, we need not wonder at what he says, page 197; "Neither could I here suffer myself to direct Christians to ask the Pardon of their Sins, upon the bare Confession of them; or to expect it merely upon their intreating Forgiveness for the Sake of Jesus Christ; but have thought it agreeable to the Gospel to make it their own Disposition and Act, to ask and expect Forgiveness as *his* Disciples, upon *his* Conditions only, *viz.* the forsaking their Sins, and the actual Amendment of their Lives." So then, it seems, we must ask for, and expect Forgiveness only upon the Account of our own Repentance and Amendment. But what Assurance can this Gentleman give me, that God must, or will, grant me Forgiveness, *only* upon the Account of my Repentance and Amendment? Is my Repentance and Amendment for the future, any Satisfaction

tisfaction for past Transgressions? That Re-
 pentance and Amendment is the Condition of
 Pardon, I will grant; and I will grant, that
 no one ought to expect Forgiveness upon Con-
 fession *only*, or *only* upon asking it for the
 Sake of Christ: But to tell me, that I must
 ask, yea and expect Forgiveness upon my Re-
 pentance and Amendment *only*, is shocking,
 it is monstrous, it is a denying of Christianity.
 I must repent and amend, otherwise I ought
 not to expect Forgiveness; but I must not ex-
 pect Forgiveness upon the Account of my Re-
 pentance and Amendment *only*, but I must
 ask it and expect it for the Sake, and upon
 the *alone Merits* of Jesus Christ; whose Merits
 and Satisfaction is the *Foundation* of God's ac-
 cepting our Repentance and Amendment, *con-*
sistently with the Honour of his divine Law.
 This is Catholic Doctrine, this is Christian
 Faith. But to teach me to ask for Pardon,
 and to depend upon my Repentance and A-
 mendment *only* for it, is plainly to deny the
 Necessity of Christ's Merits and Satisfaction to
 my Forgiveness. And very consistently with
 this Doctrine, in all the Forms of Prayer
 which our Author has drawn up, he never
 once mentions the *Merits, Mediation, or Inter-*
cession of Jesus Christ, or asks any thing for
his Sake, or through his Merits; but teaches us
 to pray in the following *affected Manner*, viz.
 page 118, "Expecting Pardon and Favour
 "from God, upon the Terms of his (Jesus
 "Christ's) Gospel * *only*." From what has
 been said, the Reader will easily perceive in

* To the same Purpose, Pages 207, 208, 204.

what Sense he uses the Word *only*, as he will from what follows, *page 123.* "I am truly
 " sensible of thy Love to Mankind, in send-
 " ing thy Son into the World, *to enliven and*
 " *strengthen by his excellent Doctrine, and by his*
 " *holy Example, our sincere Endeavours to know*
 " *and practise thy Commandments.*" If Christ
 did no more for us than this, the Passage
 smells rank of Socinianism. *Page 124,* "In
 " his (*Jesus Christ's*) Name, and as *his* Disciple,
 " I implore thy Pardon, and intreat thy Fa-
 " vour." *Page 204,* "Accept O Lord, this
 " my first Service of this Day, *according to the*
 " *Goodness of thy own Nature, declared by*
 " *thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.*" To the
 same Purpose *page 213.* Again *page 214,*
 "As his Disciple, I intreat of thee the Par-
 " don &c." *Page 222,* "I beg of thee, *out*
 " *of the abundant Goodness of thy Nature, (note*
 " *Reader, he does not say for the Sake or Me-*
 " *rits of Christ) to overlook and supply all the*
 " *Defects of my Services.*" Again *page 243,*
 "In *his* Name, and as *his* Disciple, I trust for
 " Acceptance." So *page 252,* "Beseeching
 " thee to hear and to accept us, as the *Disci-*
 " *ples of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord.*" It
 is true, he adds some of the *Church-Prayers* at
 the End of his Book, which conclude, *through*
the Merits &c. for Jesus Christ's Sake, and for
the Honour of our Mediator and Advocate. But
 this an intelligent Reader will look upon as no
 more than a *Salvo*; there being so wide a Dif-
 ference in the Turn and Spirit of *his* Prayers,
 and those of the Church; especially since we
 have seen from his own Words, he makes the
 Death of Christ not to be a *Sacrifice* and *Satis-*
faction

satisfaction for Sin, but only a *Seal* or *Testimony* to confirm the Truth of his Doctrine.

Lastly, the Catholic Church maintains the true Christian Faith to be this; That we believe and confess, that our Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God, is God and Man: This is also the express Doctrine of our Church (see Article ii.); And whoever denies the *Divinity* of our Lord Jesus Christ, is a downright *Arian*. Now our Author does not once throughout his whole Book, assert his Divinity, or give him any one Attribute that strictly implies *Divinity*. Nay there are some Passages, that look a quite contrary Way. Thus page 85, he speaks of “*Real Believers in Christ,*” (how? why,) as sent into the World by God. Does this raise him above a *created* Being? No sure! Again page 124, “accept this sincere “*Profession of my Faith in thee, the only true “ God; and in Jesus Christ whom thou hast “ sent.*” This is his Faith: And the Catholic Faith is “*That we worship one God in Tri- “ nity, and Trinity in Unity:*” Whether his Faith agrees with this, God and himself best know. Again page 203, “*I intreat of thee a- “ lone, as the Father and Judge of Mankind.*” So page 206, “*I seek the Pardon of my Sins “ from thy Fatherly Mercy and Goodness alone.*” Words, which to me seem to deny, as well the *Divinity*, as the *Satisfaction* of our Lord Jesus Christ.

And it has with good Reason, I think, been observed *, that considering, “*how sparingly “ he uses the Word Saviour, and how often*

* See *Winchester Converts*, Page 27.

“ and *affectedly* he joins the Words *Master* and
 “ *Disciples*, whenever he speaks of *Christ* and
 “ *Mankind* together; it looks as if his *prophe-*
 “ *tical* Office was what he *chiefly* considered in
 “ him.” As to the *Personality* and *Godhead*
 of the Holy Ghost, there is not a Word in
 the Book about it; and to me there are some
 things in his long Discourse on 1 Cor. xii. 13.
 which seem to look another Way.

I had Thoughts when I first set Pen to Pa-
 per, to have shewn some of the Inconsistencies
 in this Book, which are many: But I begin to
 be weary of following an Author up and
 down, who has hardly *one* Sentence through-
 out his whole Performance, but what deserves
 the Lash; and I believe the Reader will think
 it sufficient thus far to have overthrown his
 Hypothesis, to have confuted his Explications
 and Glosses upon Scripture, to have shew'd
 how much he has misrepresented the Doctrine
 of our Church, and to have pointed out some
 Passages, which in their plain natural Con-
 struction, contradict the received Faith of
 Christ's Church.

* “ If the Main of what I have said, be
 “ true, the Author would do well, in the
 “ Fear of God to own it in a plain and open
 “ Manner, and undo (as far as possible) the
 “ Evil of his Book. This cannot be done,
 “ but by a thorow Retraction of it, which
 “ he will hasten to do, if his Heart be duly
 “ touched with a true Sense of the great Of-
 “ fence he has given to the Church of *England*,

* See the worthy Mr Archdeacon *Marsden's* Address to
 the Bishop of *B——r*. Page 112.

“ and

“ and the whole Church of Christ. Next to
 “ Innocence is Repentance; but this is never
 “ sincere, without our making that Restitu-
 “ tion, which it is in our Power to make.
 “ But if he shall persist in the Defence of
 “ what he has done; he will make his *Ill*
 “ *worse*, be daily more and more entangled
 “ in his own Net, and be easily marked out
 “ and shewn as a *Spectacle of Ridicule and Scorn*
 “ to every vulgar Eye: Good Men will detest
 “ his Character, and he has Reason to fear,
 “ God will be stirring up Vengeance for his
 “ Impenitence.”

I beg leave of the serious Reader to say a Word or two more, and then I have done.

Do not say, *the Table of the Lord is contemptible*, or imagine that the *Bread of God*, that which is offered to him as Figures of the precious Body and Blood of Christ, and which he returns to us for a spiritual Banquet, full of Life-power: Do not imagine, I say, that this is common Bread and Wine; but consider who instituted this Sacrifice, by *whose Commission* it is celebrated, for *what End* it was appointed, and the *Promise* Christ has made of being with his *commission'd* Officers in the Celebration of it.

First. Consider *who* instituted this Christian Sacrifice, this divine Worship and Service of the Christian Church. It was our Lord Christ himself, the Founder and supreme Head of the Church, who in the same Night that he was betray'd, took Bread and Wine, and when he had blessed them, said, *This is my Body given for you, this is my Blood shed for you: Do this for a Memorial of me.* The Author of Salvation is the Founder of this Ordinance; his Or-

dinance therefore must not be *despised*, but *attended to* by all who would be saved by him: For he is the Author of Salvation to them that obey him, not to those who disobey him. Remember, that from the Beginning God hath enjoined *positive Duties*: *Adam* himself was under the Injunction of *positive Duty*, and lost *Paradise* by the Breach of it.

2dly. Consider by *whose Commission* this *divine Service* is celebrated. The Materials of this Holy Feast cannot be deemed common Bread and Wine, in that they are *dedicated* to God in Memory of Christ, with Prayer for a divine Blessing, by a *commission'd Officer* of Christ. When our Saviour had *took* Bread and Wine, and *blessed* them, and said of them, *This is my Body given for you, this is my Blood shed for you*; he commanded and *commissioned* his *Apostles*, and in them their *Successors* and *Substitutes*, the *Bishops* and *Priests* of the Christian Church, deriving their Commission from them, *to make a Memorial before God* of his Death and Passion, in the *appointed Representations* of his Body and Blood. And can you think that this *Memorial* is not accepted by God, and beneficial to us, when it is made by such as are appointed to that Holy Office by a *proper Commission*, and so according to the Will, and by an Authority, derived originally from our Lord Christ?

3dly. Consider for *what End* this *divine Service* was appointed, *viz. for a Memorial to God*, *i. e.* to represent and shew forth Christ's Death to him, that he may see it, and behold it in the appointed Memorials thereof, and remember it for our Good. *Do this*, says our Lord,

Lord, *for a Memorial of me*, to bring my Death and Passion into Remembrance before God: Not as if God could forget it, or has any *need* to be put in Mind of it, as if his Memory could fail him; but that by this *appointed* Memorial we may *engage* him to remember the Covenant of Grace, founded on the Sacrifice and Priesthood of Christ, and that he may be propitious to us in the Pardon of our Sins, and in confirming to us the other Benefits of Christ's Passion, for the Sake of the *grand* Sacrifice itself, which we then commemorate and represent to him, in the Manner Christ has appointed. Remember then, that this divine Service being the *appointed* Memorial, the *instituted* Representation made to God of his Son's Death and Passion, to engage him to be favourable and gracious to us; it is therefore, by Virtue of the grand Sacrifice commemorated and represented by it, available to the Pardon of Sin; for does not our Lord say of the Wine, *This is my Blood of the New Testament, or Covenant, shed for the Remission of Sins*; It is also the Means of deriving to us the Grace of the divine Spirit; for does not our Lord say concerning his *sacramental* Body and Blood, *It is the Spirit that quickneth*; and *the Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life*: Hence it is the Conveyance of a Principle of Immortality; for has not our Lord said, *Who so eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life; and I will raise him up at the last Day; for my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed*. Is not this divine Service therefore the appointed Claim of the Covenant of Grace?

is

is it not the means of renewing Covenant, and holding Communion with God? Shall we therefore despise that, which is an *appointed Memorial* to God, and by consequence the Means of divine Grace and Favour to us?

4thly. Consider the *Promise* Christ has made to be with his *Commission'd Officers* in the Celebration of this divine Service. When he had commission'd his Apostles to make a Representation of his Death to God, in the *appointed Memorials* of his Body and Blood, saying unto them, *Do this for a Memorial of me*; he afterwards promised, that he would be with *them*, and with their *Successors* and *Substitutes*, in the Execution of all Parts of their Office, and therefore in the Execution of this, even unto the End of the World; saying unto them, *Math. xxviii. 20. Lo! I am with you, you my Apostles, whom I have commission'd to baptize, to administer the Eucharist, &c. even unto the End of the World*: And therefore with their Successors and Substitutes unto the End of the World; since they themselves were not to continue in Person unto the End of the World. Will you then despise that holy Feast, which Christ himself instituted, which he commanded his Apostles to continue for a Memorial of him, before God, and in the Celebration of which he promis'd to be with them, and their Successors and Substitutes, even unto the End of the World? Will you despise that, of which Christ said, *This is my Body given for you, this is my Blood shed for you*? which, he saith, is *the Meat that endureth unto everlasting Life*; which he calleth the *Bread of God*, and the *life-giving Bread*?

I say

I say, will you despise that, which Christ dignifies with the Name and Title of his *Flesh* and *Blood*, and which he assures us, is so in Life and Spirit, in Power and Effect, by the enlivening Energy of the Holy Spirit? Certainly, if these Things be duly considered you will not *despise* it! but and then will you *neglect* it? Many, tho' they cannot deny, but that it is a main Duty of Christianity to attend the Holy Eucharist, yet live in the Neglect of it: They think it a very good thing to frequent it; but yet do not think that the Neglect of it is a Sin, that will eternally undo them. But they must be undeceived in this Matter. To which purpose, be pleas'd to consider what follows. If we believe it to be a Duty, can we with any manner of Reason expect to be saved by Christ, when we live in the Neglect of that, which he made to be our Duty? The Scripture saith, *Heb. v. 9.* He is the Author of Salvation to all them that obey him: But is this to obey him, to live in the Neglect of what he hath made our Duty? Certainly, you will not say it is... Can we expect to be saved, if we wilfully neglect the Means of Salvation? But do not we neglect the Means of Salvation, if we neglect to feed upon that Food, *which endureth unto everlasting Life?*... Is there any effectual Way of pleading Christ's Merits before God, but that Way which *himself* hath appointed for the *shewing forth his Death* unto God? And can we expect to be saved without pleading Christ's Merits?... We cannot *merit* Happiness, nor lay claim to it, by our own *Deservings*; we
have

have no Title to it, but by Covenant; and can we expect the Benefit of the Covenant, when we are not careful to renew it, and to keep up Communion with God?... Consider what a Stress our Saviour lays upon this Duty, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, except, ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.* John vi. 53. He positively makes the receiving of this Sacrament necessary to all, who are capable of receiving it. These are Words, which every Christian Man or Woman should have in their Mind, who go out of the Church when the Sacrament is to be administered, or refuse to receive it: For when our Lord saith, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you,* he doth not mean eating it *now and then*, or once or twice in a Year, or perhaps in our Life-time: The Word is *τρέφω*, which signifies to *feed* upon a thing as *constant Food*: And therefore the Thing that he requires of us, is to feed upon it constantly, as often as we have Opportunity. And it deserves to be considered, whether at the Day of Judgment, Christ may not say unto such as despise or neglect this Holy Sacrament; “Did not I tell you the Way to Happiness? did I not say unto you most expressly, *Verily, verily, except ye feed on the Flesh of the Son of Man, and make his Blood your Drink, ye have no Life in you?* How then can you expect eternal Happiness, when you neglected the means which I appointed for attaining it?” In a Word, all God’s Favours and Blessings are free, and we must be content to lay hold of them

without them. If we will not be saved in the Manner he has appointed, there is no Help for it; God is not *bound* to depart from his Rule, or to save us in a Manner of our own *choosing*: He has no where promis'd it, and therefore we have no Reason to expect it, but the contrary.

But that no one may think, the Strefs is laid upon a mere outward Formality, upon the *bare* Action of eating and drinking the Holy Eucharist, we must remember, that there is a *certain Manner* of eating and drinking this divine Food, that it may be salutary to us, the Seal of Pardon and the Conveyance of divine Grace: That is to say, this holy Food must be eaten in a *spiritual Manner*, which in the Sense of the Primitive Church, implies these two Things. *First*, that we eat and drink it, not as *mere* Bread and Wine, or as *bare* empty Representations, but as the Body and Blood of Christ in *Power and Effect*, by means of the enlivening Energy of the life-giving Spirit, communicating itself to, and conveying itself by the Holy Symbols, or the sacramental Body and Blood. And, *2dly*. That we eat and drink with that Preparation and Devotion of Mind, which befits so solemn and divine an Institution, *i. e.* with *humble*, and *penitent*, and *believing* and *thankful* Hearts and Resolutions to live in all Respects, as becomes the Gospel of Christ. Then, as St *Austin* speaks, *will the Body and Blood of Christ be Life to every Man, if that which is visibly taken, be spiritually eaten and spiritually drunk*; if it be eaten in a spiri-

have no Title to it, but by Covenant; and can we expect the Benefit of the Covenant, when we are not careful to renew it, and to keep up Communion with God? . . . Consider what a Stress our Saviour lays upon this Duty, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, except, ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you.* John vi. 53. He positively makes the receiving of this Sacrament necessary to all, who are capable of receiving it. These are Words, which every Christian Man or Woman should have in their Mind, who go out of the Church when the Sacrament is to be administred, or refuse to receive it: For when our Lord saith, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you,* he doth not mean eating it *now and then*, or once or twice in a Year, or perhaps in our Life-time: The Word is *τρέφω*, which signifies to *feed* upon a thing as *constant Food*: And therefore the Thing that he requires of us, is to feed upon it constantly, as often as we have Opportunity. And it deserves to be considered, whether at the Day of Judgment, Christ may not say unto such as despise or neglect this Holy Sacrament; “ Did not I tell “ you the Way to Happiness? did I not say “ unto you most expressly, *Verily, verily, ex- “ cept ye feed on the Flesh of the Son of Man, and “ make his Blood your Drink, ye have no Life “ in you?* How then can you expect eternal “ Happiness, when you neglected the means “ which I appointed for attaining it?” In a Word, all God’s Favours and Blessings are free, and we must be content to lay hold of them

without them. If we will not be saved in the Manner he has appointed, there is no Help for it; God is not *bound* to depart from his Rule, or to save us in a Manner of our own *choosing*: He has no where promis'd it, and therefore we have no Reason to expect it, but the contrary.

But that no one may think, the Stress is laid upon a mere outward Formality, upon the *bare* Action of eating and drinking the Holy Eucharist, we must remember, that there is a *certain Manner* of eating and drinking this divine Food, that it may be salutary to us, the Seal of Pardon and the Conveyance of divine Grace: That is to say, this holy Food must be eaten in a *spiritual Manner*, which in the Sense of the Primitive Church, implies these two Things. *First*, that we eat and drink it, not as *mere* Bread and Wine, or as *bare* empty Representations, but as the Body and Blood of Christ in *Power and Effect*, by means of the enlivening Energy of the life-giving Spirit, communicating itself to, and conveying itself by the Holy Symbols, or the sacramental Body and Blood. And, *2dly*. That we eat and drink with that Preparation and Devotion of Mind, which befits so solemn and divine an Institution, *i. e.* with *humble*, and *penitent*, and *believing* and *thankful* Hearts and Resolutions to live in all Respects, as becomes the Gospel of Christ. Then, as St *Austin* speaks, *will the Body and Blood of Christ be Life to every Man, if that which is visibly taken, be spiritually eaten and spiritually drunk*; if it be eaten in a spiri-

tual Manner; that is to say, If the outward Symbols be eaten and drunk; as that, which is the Body and Blood of Christ in Power and Effect, and with penitent Hearts, and sincere Desires of growing in Grace and Goodness, and of living up to the Gospel of Christ.



APPENDIX.



APPENDIX.

WHEN I had drawn up the Foregoing, I thought it might not be unacceptable to the serious Reader, to add some Testimonies from the *Fathers, antient Liturgies, and Councils*, in Behalf of the Doctrine which I have endeavoured to vindicate.

Clemens Romanus flourish'd about the Year of our Lord 65. In his Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Chap. xlv. he says thus ; “ It will be “ no small Crime, if we eject those from the “ *Episcopal Office*, who offer the *Gifts* in an “ unblameable and holy Manner.”

St *Ignatius*, who flourish'd *A. D.* 101, in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, Chap. x. says thus ; “ Let no Man deceive himself ; he “ who is not within the Altar, is deprived of “ the *Bread of God*.” Now that the *Bread of God* signifies in Scripture, a material Sacrifice offered to God, the Reader may be satisfied by consulting *Lev.* xxi. 6, 8, 17. and *Lev.* xxii. 5.

St *Justin Martyr*, who flourished *A. D.* 140, in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, says thus ; “ In
Q 2 this

“ this Prophecy (*Isaiab xxxiii. 16.*) he clearly
 “ speaks of the *Bread*, which (Bread) our
 “ Christ has instructed us to offer (*αοιαι*) for a
 “ Memorial of his Incarnation, for the Sake
 “ of them that believe in him, &c.”

St *Irenæus* Bishop of *Lyons*, who flourished
A. D. 167, in *lib. iv. cap. 32.* says thus,
 “ Our Lord instructing his Apostles to offer
 “ first Fruits to God, of his own Creatures,
 “ not as if *he* wanted, but that *they* might not
 “ be unfruitful nor ungrateful, took Bread
 “ (which is a Creature of God) and gave
 “ Thanks saying, *This is my Body*, and in like
 “ manner he declared the *Cup* (which is also
 “ a Creature of God) to be his Blood, and so
 “ taught the *new Oblation* of the *New Testa-*
 “ *ment*, which the Church receiving from
 “ the Apostles offers to God throughout the
 “ *whole World.*”

Tertullian, who flourish'd about *A. D. 192*,
 (*de Oratione, cap. xiv.*) says thus; “ On the
 “ stationary (*i. e. fasting*) Days, many think
 “ they ought not to be present at the Prayers
 “ of the Sacrifices, lest their Fast should be
 “ broken by receiving the Body of our Lord;
 “ Does therefore the *Eucharist* slacken our
 “ due Devotion to God, or rather bind us
 “ faster to God? Will not your Station be
 “ more solemn, if you attend at God's *Altar*?
 “ By taking the Body of our Lord, and re-
 “ serving it (*viz. to be eaten when your Fast is*
 “ *done*) both will be secured, *viz. the parta-*
 “ *king of the Sacrifice*, and the Performance of
 “ your Duty.

Origen, who flourished about *A. D. 230*,
 in his Book against *Celsus*, says; “ Let *Celsus*

“ as one that knows not God, offer his Ea-
 “ charistic Sacrifices to Dæmons; but we, ap-
 “ peasing the Creator of all things, eat Loaves
 “ offered with Thanksgiving and Prayer over
 “ the Gifts, they being made a *certain holy*
 “ *Body* by means of Prayer.”

St Cyprian, Archbishop of Carthage, who
 flourish'd about *A. D.* 248, in his 63d Epistle
 says; “ Jesus Christ our Lord and God, was
 “ the Author and Institutor of this *Sacrifice*—
 “ And who was more the Priest of the most
 “ high God, than our Lord Jesus Christ,
 “ who offered up a *Sacrifice* to the Father, the
 “ same Sacrifice which *Melchisedek* had offered
 “ before him, that is, Bread and Wine, to
 “ wit, his Body and Blood? — And if Jesus
 “ Christ our Lord and God be himself the
 “ great High-Priest of God the Father, and
 “ accordingly first offered his own Person, as
 “ a Sacrifice to his Father, and afterwards
 “ directed us to do the like in Commemoration
 “ of him, the Priest then offers up to God the
 “ Father, in his Church, the truest and com-
 “ pleatest *Sacrifice*, if he celebrates it in the
 “ manner, wherein he is assured Christ him-
 “ self did celebrate it.”

Eusebius Bishop of *Cæsarea*, who flourished a-
 bout *A. D.* 315, in *lib. viii. in Gen.* xlix. 12, says,
 “ Christ himself delivered to his Disciples the
 “ Symbols of the divine Oeconomy, com-
 “ manding them to offer the *Image* of his own
 “ Body.”

Athanasius Bishop of *Alexandria*, in *Orat. de*
Melchisedek, says; “ He (*viz.* *Melchisedek*)
 “ was the first Example of offering the *unbloody*
 “ *Sacrifice*, (*viz.* *Bread and Wine*) therefore it

was

“was said to our Saviour, Thou art a Priest
“for ever after the Order of Melchisedek.”

St Cyril of Jerusalem, who flourished about
A. D. 350, in *Catechism. Mystagog.* says;

“We beseech God, the Lover of Man, to
“send his Holy Spirit upon the Gifts laid be-
“fore him (ἐν τῇ τῇ προσέλευσιν) that he may make
“the Bread the Body of Christ, and the Wine
“the Blood of Christ.”

Macarius, who flourished about A. D. 373,
Hom. 27. says; “At that Time the great

“Men, and Righteous, and Prophets knew
“that a Redeemer was coming—but they
“knew not that Bread and Wine were to be
“offered in the Church, as the Antitypes of
“his Body and Blood.”

St Ambrose Bishop of Milan, who flourished
A. D. 374, in *Lib. I. de Officiis, cap. xlviii.* says;

“Formerly a Lamb was offered, a Calf was
“offered, now Christ is offered, and he offers
“himself as a Priest for the Forgiveness of
“our Sins: In an Image here (on Earth) in
“the Verity there, where he interposes as an
“Advocate with the Father.”

St Jerome, who flourished about A. D. 378,
in his Commentary on *Matthew xxvi.* says;

“When our Saviour had fulfilled the Typical
“Passover, he takes Bread which strengthens
“Man’s Heart, and passes to the true Sacra-
“ment of the Passover; that as Melchisedek,
“the Priest of the most high God, to
“prefigure him, had offered Bread and Wine,
“so he also might represent the Verity of his
“own Body and Blood.”

St Austin Bishop of Hippo, who flourished
A. D. 396, *de Civitate Dei, lib. xvi. cap. 22,*

says;

says; "When *Melchisedek* blessed *Abraham*,
 "then first that Sacrifice appeared, which is
 "now offered by Christians throughout the
 "World." And *Lib. xvii. cap. 17.* "The Priest-
 "hood and Sacrifice of *Aaron* is banished,
 "and what *Melchisedek* brought forth when
 "he blessed *Abraham*, is every where offered
 "under the Priesthood of Christ." And
Lib. xx. cap. 18. "Christians celebrate the
 "Memory of *that* Sacrifice by the most holy
 "Oblation, and Participation of the Body and
 "Blood of Christ."

Fulgentius, A. D. 525. Lib. de fide ad Pet. cap. ix. says; "In the time of the Old Testa-
 "ment, living Creatures were offered—Now
 "in the Time of the New Testament the Ho-
 "ly Catholic Church, throughout the World,
 "ceases not to offer the Sacrifices of Bread
 "and Wine in Faith and Charity. For in those
 "carnal Sacrifices the Flesh of Christ was fi-
 "gured, which he *was* to offer, and his
 "Blood, which he was to shed for the Remis-
 "sion of Sins. But in *this* Sacrifice, there is
 "giving of Thanks, and a Commemoration
 "of the Flesh of Christ, which he hath offer-
 "ed, and of his Blood which he hath shed
 "for us. In *those* Sacrifices therefore, what
 "was to be given, was signified in a Figure:
 "but in *this* Sacrifice, is evidently shewn
 "what is *already* given. In *those* Sacrifices,
 "the Son of God, it was foretold, *should be*
 "slain for Sinners; In *this* he is declared and
 "published, as *actually* slain for them."

The Reader may find more Testimonies,
 from those I have now mentioned, and from
 others

others of the antient Fathers, in the Appendix to *Johnson's* Unbloody Sacrifice. To these Testimonies from the Fathers, I shall add some from the antient Liturgies. In the *Clementine* Liturgy, the oldest Liturgy that is extant, we read thus; "Wherefore having
 " in Remembrance his (Christ's) Passion &c.
 " we offer to thee our King and our God, according to his *Institution*, this *Bread* and
 " this *Cup* &c. And send thy Holy Spirit,
 " the Witness of the Sufferings of the Lord
 " Jesus on this Sacrifice, that he may make
 " this *Bread* the *Body* of thy Christ, and this
 " *Cup* the Blood of thy Christ: That all who
 " shall partake of it, may be confirm'd in
 " Godliness, may receive Remission of their
 " Sins may be delivered from the Devil and
 " his Wiles, may be fulfilled with the Holy
 " Ghost, may be made worthy of thy Christ,
 " and may obtain everlasting Life; Thou O
 " Lord Almighty, being reconciled to them."

In the Liturgy of St *James*, which was antiently used in the Church of *Jerusalem*, the first Christian Church, the Priest says thus;
 "Wherefore having in Remembrance his
 " (Christ's) life-giving Passion &c. we Sinners
 " offer to thee, O Lord, this tremendous
 " and unbloody Sacrifice, &c. Send down
 " upon these *Gifts*, which are here set before
 " thee, thy most Holy Spirit; that by his
 " holy, good, and glorious Presence, he may
 " sanctify and make this *Bread* the holy *Body*
 " of thy Christ, and this *Cup* the precious
 " Blood of thy Christ: That all who are Partakers thereof may obtain Remission of
 " their

“ their Sins, and eternal Life, may be sanctified in Soul and Body, &c.”

In the Liturgy of St *Mark*, being the ancient Liturgy of the Church of *Alexandria*, of which St *Mark* was the first Bishop, and which was used throughout that Patriarchate, containing *Egypt*, *Libya*, *Pentapolis*, and *Ethiopia*, the Priest says thus; “ shewing forth
“ therefore, O Lord Almighty, Heavenly
“ King, the Death of thine only begotten
“ Son &c. *We have set before thee thine own,*
“ *out of thine own Gifts, &c.* Send down thy
“ Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these
“ Loaves and these Cups, that the Almighty
“ God may sanctify and thoroughly consecrate
“ them, making the *Bread* the *Body* and the
“ *Cup* the *Blood* of the New Testament of our
“ Lord himself, our God, our Saviour, and
“ supreme King Jesus Christ: That they may
“ be to us who partake of them, the Means
“ of Faith, &c. and the Remission of our
“ Sins.”

In the Liturgy of St *John Chrysostom*, which is the Liturgy used in the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, the Priest says thus; “ In Remembrance therefore of this Command of
“ our Saviour &c. We offer to thee thine own
“ out of thine own Gifts, &c. We offer to thee
“ this reasonable and unbloody Worship, and
“ beg, pray, beseech, thee to send down thine
“ holy Spirit upon us and upon these Gifts lying
“ before thee—Make this *Bread* thee precious
“ *Body* of thy Christ, and what is in this *Cup*,
“ the precious *Blood* of thy Christ; that it
“ may be to those who partake of it for So-

R

“ briety,

“briety, the Remission of Sins, the Commu-
“nication of the Holy Ghost, &c.”

In the Liturgy of *St Basil*, which is used upon some of the great Festivals, throughout the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, the Priest says thus; “Wherefore we also, O Lord, “having in Remembrance &c. offer to thee “*thine own* out of *thine own* Gifts—and lay-
“ing before thee these Symbols of the holy Bo-
“dy and Blood of thy Christ, we pray and
“beseech thee, O thou Holy of Holies, of
“thy gracious Goodness, to send down thine
“Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these Gifts,
“to bless, to sanctify, to perfect them——
“Make this *Bread* the precious *Body* of our
“Lord, our God, and Saviour Jesus Christ;
“and this *Cup* the precious *Blood* of our Lord,
“our God and Saviour Jesus Christ, &c.”

In the Liturgy of *St Basil*, as it is used throughout the Patriarchate of *Alexandria*, the Priest says thus; “In Remembrance
“therefore, &c. we offer to thee *thine own*,
“out of *thine own* Gifts——We beseech, pray
“and bow down ourselves to thee, that of thy
“gracious Goodness, thou wilt send down
“thine Holy Spirit upon us thy Servants, and
“upon these Gifts lying before thee, to bless
“them—that he may make this *Bread* the
“holy *Body* of our Lord, our God and Sa-
“viour Jesus Christ, for the Remission of
“Sins and everlasting Life, to all those who
“partake of it; and this *Cup* the precious
“*Blood* of our Lord, our God and Saviour
“Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and
“everlasting Life to all who partake of it &c.”

In

In the Liturgy of the Church of *Ethiopia*, a great Country beyond *Egypt*, the Priest says thus; "And now O Lord, celebrating the Memorial &c. we offer to thee this Bread" and this *Cup*, &c. We pray thee, O Lord, "we beseech thee to send down thy Holy Spirit and Power upon this Bread, and upon this Cup, that he may make them both the *Body* and *Blood* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."

Likewise in the *Gothic* Missal, which was used in *Spain*, and in those Churches of *Gallia* that were under the Government of the *Goths*; and in the antient *Gallican* Missal, which was used in all the Churches of *Gaul* and *Britain*, before the *Goths* conquered any Part of the *Roman* Empire, and continu'd to be used in some Parts of *Gaul* and *Britain* for several Ages after; and in the *Mozarabic* Missal, which was antiently used in *Africa*, and afterwards in *Spain*, from the Time it was conquered by the *Moors*, about the Year of our Lord 714, till about the Year 1080; in all these, the *Elements* are offered to God with Prayer for the Presence and Blessing of the life-giving Spirit upon them.

I proceed, in the last Place, to give some farther Testimonies, from the ancient *Councils*. The second, aliàs third of those Canons, call'd *Apostolical*, which are the most antient of the Canons which are come down to us, provides, that no Bishop or Priest do offer any thing in Sacrifice on the Altar, besides what our Lord hath commanded: And what those Things are which our Lord commanded to be offered,

the

the Reader has seen from the foregoing Testimonies.

The Synod of *Ancyra* (A. D. 315,) in the 5th Canon, requires, that "they who had eaten things offered to Idols, but with Tears in their Eyes, thereby signifying their inward Averſion, ſhould after having been Penitents for three Years, be received to Communion, but *without the Oblation.*"

By the eleventh Canon of the firſt *Oecumenical* Council of *Nice* (A. D. 325.) it is provided, that *they who have tranſgreſſed, i. e. done Sacrifice to Idols, without Compulſion, ſhall continue three Years among the Hearers, be Subſtrators ſeven Years, and for two Years communicate with the People in Prayer, without the Oblation.*

The Synod of *Gangræ* (A. D. 340.) in the 4th Canon, cenſures thoſe, *who reſuſe to partake of the Oblation, when it is made by a married Prieſt.*

The 24th Canon of the 3^d *alias* 6th Council of *Carthage*, (A. D. 397.) provides, that *in the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, nothing be offered, but what the Lord hath delivered, that is, Bread and Wine mixed with Water.*

Theſe are ſome of the many Testimonies that have been brought from Antiquity, in Proof and for the Confirmation of the representative Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, under the Symbols of Bread and Wine in the Holy Eucharift: And thus Reader you ſee, if *Scripture* and *Antiquity* be good Proofs of any Doctrine, we have them both on our Side, for the Representative Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Holy Eucharift, under the Symbols of Bread and Wine.

5 0059

Deo tri-uni Gloria. Amen.

ng

ne

at-

rs

rd

ii-

n-

ti-

d,

ri-

ue

se-

th

ne

of

st.

cil

be

ng

at

at

of

ve

n-

ne

if

ny

e,

ly

tt,